DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 638 SP 037 998

AUTHOR	Castenell, Louis A., Ed.; Tarule, Jill M., Ed.
TITLE	The Minority Voice in Educational Reform: An Analysis by Minority and Women College of Education Deans.
ISBN	ISBN-1-56750-319-5
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	185p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ablex Publishing Corporation, 55 Old Post Road #2, P.O. Box 5297, Greenwich, CT 06830.
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Deans; Administrators; Black Colleges; Black Students; Blacks; College Administration; Diversity (Student); *Educational Change; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Evaluation Methods; Excellence in Education; *Females; Feminism; Higher Education; Leadership; *Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Public Education; Racial Discrimination; School Based Management; *Schools of Education; Sex Discrimination; Student Evaluation; Teacher Empowerment; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS	Alternative Assessment

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers examines the issue of minority and female deans in colleges of education, offering the current thinking by a group of minority and female deans of education. Part 1, "Changing Leadership: Tensions within Academic and Social Roles," presents the first four chapters: (1) "Surviving the Middle Passage: The Absent Legacy of African American Women Education Deans?" (Beverly Lindsay); (2) "The Contemporary Challenge: Family and Work Issues for Women in Higher Education" (Nancy Hensel); (3) "Recharting the Paths of Women and Minority Leaders: A Journey of Consequence" (Jane Stallings); and (4) "Deaning at a Historically Black Institution: Challenges, Opportunities, and Promise" (Portia H. Shields). Part 2, "Changing Schools: Issues of Power, Conflict, Race, and Gender," offers the last five chapters: (5) "A Profession at Risk: Changing the Image and Substance of Teacher Education" (Fannie Wiley Preston); (6) "Site-Based Management and Teacher Empowerment in Educational Reform: Can the Power be Shifted?" (Marilyn J. Haring); (7) "Academics and Cultural Excellence for African American Students: Imperatives for Public Education" (Hugh J. Scott); (8) "Developing a Multicultural Focus in Teacher Education: One Department's Story" (Barbara J. Shade); and (9) "Restructuring American Schools: A Perspective on Testing and Assessment" (Trevor E. Sewell and Constance V. Hines). (All papers contain references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 638

The Minority Voice in Educational Reform

AN ANALYSIS BY MINORITY AND WOMEN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION DEANS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Bernstein

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

edited by LOUIS A. CASTENELL
& JILL M. TARULE

SP037998

The Minority Voice in Educational Reform

An Analysis by Minority and Women College of Education Deans

Contemporary Studies in Social and Policy Issues in Education: The David C. Anchin Series (formerly Social and Policy Issues in Education: The David C. Anchin Series)

Kathryn M. Borman, Series Editor

Assessment, Testing, and Evaluation in Teacher Education
edited by Suzanne W. Soled, 1995

Children Who Challenge the System
edited by Anne M. Bauer and Ellen M. Lynch, 1993

Critical Education for Work
edited by Richard D. Lakes, 1994

Early Childhood Education: Policy Issues for the 1990s
edited by Dolores Stegelin, 1992

Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students: School-based Strategies for Diverse Student Populations
edited by Howard Johnston and Kathryn M. Borman, 1992

Home Schooling: Political, Historical, and Pedagogical Perspectives
edited by Jan Van Galen and Mary Anne Pitman, 1991

Implementing Educational Reform: Sociological Perspectives on Educational Policy
edited by Kathryn M. Borman, Peter W. Cookson, Jr.,
Alan R. Sadovnik, and Joan Z. Spade, 1996

Informing Faculty Development for Teacher Educators
edited by Kenneth R. Howey and Nancy L. Zimpher, 1994

Investing in U.S. Schools: Directions for Educational Policy
edited by Bruce A. Jones and Kathryn M. Borman, 1994

Knowledge and Pedagogy: The Sociology of Basil Bernstein
edited by Alan R. Sadovnik, 1995

Metaphors, Maps, and Mirrors: Moral Education in Middle Schools
by Carol K. Ingall, 1997

Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives
edited by Evelyn Jacob and Cathie Jordan, 1993

The Minority Voice in Educational Reform: An Analysis by Minority and Women College of Education Deans
edited by Louis A. Castenell and Jill M. Tarule, 1997

Reinventing the University: A Radical Proposal for a Problem-Focused University
by Jan Sinnott and Lynn Johnson, 1996

Schoolteachers and Schooling: Ethoses in Conflict
by Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., and Gary N. McCloskey, O.S.A., 1996

Social Reconstruction Through Education:
The Philosophy, History, and Curricula of a Radical Ideal
edited by Michael E. James, 1995

In preparation:

Pathways to Privatization in Education
by Joseph Murphy, Scott W. Gilmer, Richard Weise and Ann Page

The Minority Voice in Educational Reform

An Analysis by Minority and Women College of Education Deans

edited by

Louis A. Castenell
University of Cincinnati

Jill M. Tarule
University of Vermont

Ablex Publishing Corporation
Greenwich, Connecticut
London, England

Copyright © 1997 by Ablex Publishing Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The minority voice in educational reform : an analysis by minority and
women college of education deans / [edited by] Louis A. Castenell &
Jill M. Tarule.
p. cm. – (Social and policy issues in education)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 1-56750-318-7 (cloth). – ISBN 1-56750-319-5 (paper)
1. Minority deans (Education)—United States. 2. Women deans
(Education)—United States. 3. Teachers colleges—United States—
Administration. 4. Educational leadership—United States.
I. Castenell, Louis Anthony, 1947- . II. Tarule, Jill Mattuck.
III. Series.
LB2341.M533 1997 96-52286
CIP

Ablex Publishing Corporation
55 Old Post Road #2
P.O. Box 5297
Greenwich, CT 06830

Published in the U.K. and Europe by:
JAI Press Ltd.
38 Tavistock Street
Covent Garden
London WC2E 7PB
England

Contents

Introduction ix

Part I

Changing Leadership: Tensions Within Academic and Social Roles

1. Surviving the Middle Passage: The Absent Legacy of African American Women Education Deans?
Beverly Lindsay 3
2. The Contemporary Challenge: Family and Work Issues for Women in Higher Education
Nancy Hensel 33
3. Recharting the Paths of Women and Minority Leaders: A Journey of Consequence
Jane Stallings 53
4. Deaning at a Historically Black Institution: Challenges, Opportunities, and Promise
Portia H. Shields 67

Part II

Changing Schools: Issues of Power, Conflict, Race, and Gender

5. A Profession at Risk: Changing the Image and Substance of Teacher Education
Fannie Wiley Preston 87
6. Site-Based Management and Teacher Empowerment in Educational Reform: Can the Power Be Shifted?
Marilyn J. Haring 103
7. Academics and Cultural Excellence for African American Students: Imperatives for Public Education
Hugh J. Scott 115
8. Developing a Multicultural Focus in Teacher Education: One Department's Story
Barbara J. Shade 135
9. Restructuring American Schools: A Perspective on Testing and Assessment
Trevor E. Sewell and Constance V. Hines 147

Author Index 167

INTRODUCTION

THE IDEA BEHIND THE BOOK

If you have attended and been an astute observer at the various professional conferences where Deans of Education gather, you would have noticed that there was a minimum of two conferences running simultaneously. The first is in the printed materials as keynotes, break out sessions, paper presentations and the like are defined as the business of the conference. The second conference goes on at the margins: meetings in the restaurants and rooms of the hotels where the conference is being held. The second conference has no printed program. It consists of individuals of like concern—frequently people who have known each other for many years as each was in many different roles—who gather to reconnect, to in the parlance of the 1990s "network," to discuss issues emerging for them in their practice. Issues not represented in the formal brochure.

For many of us, the informal program may well get constructed as carefully as the formal one. Dates are set up long before the dean leaves the office. It is not uncommon to meet a dean at a conference, suggest that perhaps you should get together later, and to see that dean pull a personal conference schedule prepared well before arriving at the conference. That personal schedule may or may not include formally scheduled conference sessions. This conference behavior is not cavalier disregard for the conference nor the presenters. It is, rather, the conduct of serious professional work, albeit invisible to the naive or new conference member.

Over the past decade or so, many of these informal or adjudevent conferences have taken on a particular function. They have not only been meetings on the margins of the conference, they are meetings of people who experience themselves, often, as on the margins of their professional group. In the conferences we attend, the membership of these informal sessions are composed of what we came to call "deans of minority status," that is Deans of Schools, Colleges or Departments of Education (SCDE deans) who are people of color, women, or both. The opportunity at these gatherings to meet with small groups—and the statistics reveal the groups are indeed small (see Hensel and Lindsay chapters following)—of peer deans whose experience is in some way reflective of the view from the margins has provided sustenance and support for many of us. It is an opportunity to reflect on what goes on at one's institution, to have a "reality check" with others, to engage in what Freire (1970) and others have identified as a process of dialogue which fosters clarity about and awareness of one's position and the subtle ways that one's minority status may influence not only leadership style but also one's visions, hopes, and the strategies employed to achieve them.

This book was born out of those dialogues as it became increasingly apparent to us that there was embedded in many of those conversations a unique perspective on issues salient to educational leadership, a perspective which for the most part remains not in the mainstream literature on either leadership or education, but in the by-waters much as female students have reported their own perspectives on themselves and their learning as being caught in some tributary to the main flow of a discipline's procedures (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Goldberger, Tarule, Clinchy & Belenky, 1996). It has become increasingly apparent that relegating these perspectives and conversations to the restaurant instead of the conference room seriously impoverishes the conversation for all of us. It limits vision and possibility.

There may be no area more critically in need of this expansion of vision and theory, practice and leadership that the field of education. It is well established that public schools, universities, and colleges must be poised to understand and address diversity.

A number of SCDE deans are concerned with these issues of diversity. Not all of them of course, are deans of minority status. In a recent report, (Castenell, et al., 1995) deans of education from land grant institutions all responded affirmatively to the general question, "How important is diversity to you?" However, responses from women and minority deans were affirmative across every category of the questionnaire including supporting minorities for promotion and tenure. The different degree of commitment concerning faculty retention between traditional males versus minorities and women, all of whom support diversity, raises the question, "How is it that certain issues of diversity remain unclear for some deans?" Armed with this recent reiteration of the invisibility of diversity issues among the leadership in higher education, we argued that it would be a significant contribution to ask only deans of minority status to write about concerns most pressing for them at this time.

All of the chapters included in this book could be published in mainstream educational journals. In fact, we were clear with the contributors that we wanted them to write a chapter that reflected their current thinking in the field. It was not necessary to emphasize in their contribution their "positionality" (Maher & Tetreault, 1994). That is, each of us comes to our work with our own perspective born out of a layered set of identities—race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual preference, etc. And that sociocultural position influences, we would contend, the content and perspective we each bring to leadership. The exercise was, thus, to amass a groups of perspectives on leadership that would reflect particular emphases, particular sensitivities and sensibilities that are usually dormant or silent in the general discourse in leadership. We were convinced that the unique perspectives that we seek in those informal conferences defined earlier would emerge and that, when aggregated, they would call attention to issues too often ignored.

UNIQUE PERSPECTIVES

By way of introducing some of the unique perspectives that we believe weave through the chapters of this text, we examine in this section some of the basic influences for deans of minority status, influences that we see as context and background for each of these minority deans.

When the focus, literature, and resulting assumptions about any given role are all drawn from a majority culture perspective, other perspectives and possibilities are rendered mute and invisible (Maher & Tetreault, 1994). For most minority deans, their perspective developed through an education in institutions run by and for the majority culture. As students, we learned about what was acceptable, even distinctive, performance. To achieve it, there was often a need to silence wisdom drawn from a different perspective, wisdom rooted in a unique perceptions drawn from a life of being a minority. We explore two facets of those perceptions below by examining what may be distinct influences and ways of *being* for African Americans and women.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN WAYS OF BEING AND INFLUENCES

Inarguably, the lived experiences of a person's life significantly impact one's perceptions and behavior. For many African Americans, their roots and social orientation come from their African American communities. These communities have a unique world view in terms of the focus on emotional vitality, interdependence, collective survival, the oral tradition, perception of time, harmonious blending, and the role of the elderly and other people of significance (White & Parham, 1990). Given the complexity of the dean's role, how might an African American dean serve as a role model as a college leader as well as a future leader in other segments of society?

Anderson, et al. (1992) in their review of the literature concluded that the administrative practices of education deans is a topic for which there is little available information. They also cited Bowker (1982) who lamented the lack of data concerning dean's activities, time in their present position, faculty concerns regarding the role of the dean, and concerns of the dean regarding the faculty.

Perhaps the most insightful article on the content of a dean's life is Bill Gardner's text (1992), which contains reflections on his fifteen years as dean in the College of Education at the University of Minnesota. Among his ruminations, Gardner identified four imperatives: teaching, information, money and faculty recruitment. These imperatives are useful to frame a brief discussion as to how an African American dean's ways of knowing may influence his/her behavior in addressing these major activities that all deans are expected to manage successfully.

The teaching imperative has to do with the dean's need to explicate multiple issues between faculty and central administration. These groups are frequently in conflict, and the dean must attempt to educate both parties if he/she wishes to advance any agenda. Gardner offered several conventional means to improve communication with the faculty including regular meetings with their representatives (e.g., senate), monthly or occasional letters for something special and "schmoozing" with faculty (e.g., unannounced drop-ins at their offices or bag lunches). Gardner's observations about the increasing needs for a dean to become an effective communicator have reached an all-time high with continuing budget reductions and increasing demand for accountability by the public on the quality of education offered by the university. These expectations play to the strength of many African American leaders. An inextricable variable within the African American community is the skillful use of multiple ways to communicate simple and complex situations spanning different cultures. If one accepts the argument that faculty is politically, economically, and socially disadvantaged by their status and central administration is dissimilarly advantaged by their status, then a leader experienced in translating messages becomes indispensable to the organization. In other words, a minority status dean is in a very strange position to understand the "minority status" of faculty and consequently provides the necessary skills to communicate messages effectively. For instance, Gardner's concept of "schmoozing," which he calls unconventional, is actually a common practice for many African Americans. We call it "rapping," "checking out," or "chilling." These behaviors are actually very complex ways of knowing. More to the point, this practice is indeed an art and extremely powerful in reaching the affective and cognitive interests of a groups that has a periphery relation to a dominant group. Thus, an African American dean whose own social status is dualistic (black person in white institution) ought to be extraordinarily sensitive to the needs of faculty, staff, and students.

The information imperative has to do with controlling and managing your own college database. Gardner explicated the rationale for a comprehensive data collection and analysis system; however, one type of data set he omitted is the use of qualitative information. There are many reasons why qualitative information is useful. For instance, a dean can bring life to a data set by making use of case studies to illustrate his/her points. This form of communication—through case studies or stories—is common to many African Americans. Our oral tradition compels us to weave information into a pattern that addresses the person within the universe. For instance, a data set that shows trends and tendencies in the amount of money generated through external grants and contracts would feature case studies illustrating how the use of funds supported research opportunities for students and faculty and how their work serves the community where they live. In other words, the dean would extrapolate a story capturing the universality of the research as an important feature of the data set. In our conversations with African American deans, this use of data in presentations has been enormously successful in influencing others on campus, especially central administration.

The money imperative has to do with the ingenuity in acquiring funds. Gardner discussed the challenges today's deans face in securing new dollars, particularly from alumni and friends of the college. Crafting a complete development program for the college is a relatively new challenge for deans. How an African American dean can contribute to an annual fund drive or acquire new sponsors for the college is an interesting question. We see one significant factor which this question raises. The factor is the issue of race as perceived by alumni and other college supporters. If the graduates and friends of the college are fundamentally racist, an African American dean has a daunting challenge before her/him. If the graduates and friends of the college are supportive of diversity of even neutral on this issue, an African American dean is advantaged. Old relationships are strengthened and new support emerges. New support comes primarily from progressive alums, friends and the institution's own minority community. Surprisingly, the minority community is overlooked as a source of financial support. One African American dean reported that his development dollars increased significantly by simply asking the minority community for help. The social trait of many African Americans to involve many people in activities is a useful tool for fund raising. Thus, the comfort necessary to expand one's relationship with others is fairly common among today's African American deans.

The final imperative, faculty recruitment, has to do with hiring people with unimpeachable qualifications. Gardner is absolutely correct in observing that hiring the best people is the most important activity a dean can do. The quality of the faculty or the values they possess will greatly shape the academic environment; thus, the intimate but appropriate involvement of the dean is critical to the advancement of the college's academic reputation. High quality faculty will actively seek employment in institutions that reflect commitments to excellence in research, teaching, and service to community. This commitment is typically measured in resources allocated to research, teaching, and service; however, increasingly excellence is measured in part to what degree diversity exists on campus and in the university. An African American dean would not only embrace this atypical notion but bring an obvious attractiveness to many applicants, especially minorities. Thus, an African American dean would have an advantage in the expanding hunt for a diverse faculty with unimpeachable qualifications.

WOMEN'S WAYS OF BEING AND INFLUENCES

In Lindsay's work (chapter following) on the nature of dominant and subdominant social groups, the idea of the "unmarked other" is presented. For the most part, women deans and deans of color are "unmarked." The basic, socially constructed image of a Dean of Education is of a white male. All other constellations of identities—white women, women of color, and men of color—are unmarked, unacknowledged in the subtle, many layered ways the society has to name and define social place, social hierarchy, and correctness. Perhaps this is most poignantly illustrated by trying to address the issues of the experience of women deans in which woman now becomes the only unmarked position: thus, gender is preserved but race is erased.

Moreover, as Greathouse observes in her chapter in this book there is a severe paucity of any inquiry about women's experience as SCDE deans. In the absence of that inquiry, we draw upon other relevant research that has examined women's ways of knowing, of moral and ethical reasoning, of ego and psychological development (Baker-Miller, 1976; Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986; Chodorow, 1978; Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983), in order to speculate on what may be unique about what women bring into leadership roles. And, as is always the case with a nondominant group, a study of their unique contribution does not suggest that those contributions are not also possessed by or important to the dominant group. They have simply been less visible and less emphasized in the dominant, majority culture perspective.

The most salient feature, drawn from the aforementioned analyses of women's psychology, is the assertion that in women's lives, thinking, and psychological development, relationships matter. It is posited that the female baby is able to differentiate from a primary female parent differently than is the male baby. Struck by sameness, she is able to develop identity while maintaining connection with another (Chodorow, 1978; Baker-Miller, 1976). Negotiating and maintaining a self-in-relation (Jordan et al., 1991) with others becomes a root metaphor in how she will go about thinking. In ethical and moral considerations, females are more likely to be concerned with issues of responsibility over those of rights, more likely to emphasize an ethic of care over an ethic of "blind" justice (Gilligan, 1982). The female learner may be a "Connected Knower" who seeks to understand ideas through dialogue rather than adversarial debate. She places her own ideas in abeyance until she feels confident she has perceived the other's perspective and she believes that developing ideas together constitutes more productive learning than amassing details or razor sharp critiques do. Although all of these are gender related rather than gender specific qualities, it is more likely that women will perceive their world with this general emphasis on the maintenance and furthering of relationships—the 3 C's, in Jane Roland Martin's (1985) terms, of care, concern, and connection.

For a woman SCDE dean, this perspective may well be an underlying gestalt for how she thinks about and approaches leadership. It can emerge as a set of particular practices in leadership that, although often both refreshing and successful, are nonetheless perceived as unusual and not reflective of a majority culture "way" (see Stallings chapter following).

One of the effects on practices of a relational approach is that the women dean may well take a stance of "people first." Often her relationship with her executive secretary may be the first place this difference emerges. We have recently observed that most of my male dean colleagues have their secretary take care of their e-mail, while most of the female ones prefer to manage that form of communication and connection directly themselves! Albeit a relatively insignificant, anecdotal observation, it does point to the basic way that a relationship focus motivates the female dean to maintain and conduct her own interactions with others.

Similarly, many women deans bring a particularly personal approach to their leadership position. Often an analysis about a problem beings not with the nature of the problem, but with the personalities involved and the interpersonal dynamics at play in the situation. There may be an intentional effort to avoid conflict, not out of fear (although women are often accused of doing so for that reason) but out of a conviction that in the maintenance of a relationship, resolution can be achieved through nonconfrontative ways using "connected thinking" and an interactional style that emphasizes care. This emphasis also includes enacting some collaboration, seeking to explore how others view both the problem and a potential solution. Such an approach represents both a predilection to creating community and an attempt to redistribute power within that community arriving, often, as Haring's chapter (following) suggests, at unique solutions.

Another aspect of this approach is frequently a conviction about and a commitment to dialogue. Relationships among adults are maintained, negotiated, and transformed through conversation. It has been suggested that both conversational style and even the intention of a conversation are different for men and women with the former concerned with a style and intention of report, while the latter emphasizes rapport (Tannen, 1990). In leading, the woman dean may well be assuming that rapport is the best way to establish and maintain control. Not infrequently, she is viewed as being indecisive and weak as a result. She is seeking collaboration and corroboration while others are looking to her to demonstrate leadership through control and pronouncements.

However, the sensitivity to dialogue and collaborative decision making is often accompanied with a particular astuteness about interpersonal and group processes. If a major underlying metaphor is to create conditions that maintain "right relations" (a phrase drawn from Native American Indian philosophy), the attention to the context in which those relations occur is critical. As a result, the relationally oriented leader may bring a new sense to the collegial groups she works with, one that emphasizes creating community and focuses on providing ways and means for diverse views to enter the dialogue.

The philosopher Sarah Ruddick (1989) proposes that his way of thinking about others and groups is rooted in "maternal thinking." She argues that the thinking that emerges as one cares for another can be analyzed just as any thinking is analyzed for the philosophical tenets embedded in it. Maternal thinking includes an attention to the particular as each individual is perceived as different and distinct, and a relationship with that individual is equally particular. Just as one sees one's children as having different and distinct needs, so might a maternal thinking leader emphasize individuality over conformity among, say, her faculty. She is likely to base decisions about faculty development and promotion on a full consideration of that individual's particular life of teaching, service, and scholarship. And she is likely to be relatively unconcerned about whether those considerations are exactly the same as those for another person.

Another distinct feature of maternal thinking is a concern for preservation. Simply put, the concern is to preserve the species through a practice of caring and responsible interpersonal relations. In leadership, this may take a particular caste of care and concern for the growth and development of people for whom the dean is responsible. Many women deans report agonizing over personnel decisions, waking at night, and other symptoms of stress, when they face a difficult and harsh decision. Although certainly these symptoms are not gender specific, they may actually have a different form for the female dean whose philosophical beliefs dictate that she do all she can to preserve relationships and the possibilities for another's development.

There are some fairly distinct problems for women deans who see the world in the ways described. Always she is faced with having both her motives and her intentions misread. Moreover, for many white, middle class women deans who have succeeded well in majority culture institutions as both student and leader, these distinctions are neither perceived nor valued. One woman dean responded to our invitation to contribute to the book by saying that she did not think being a female had any impact or importance in considerations about her role as a dean. Like her, others will argue that the kinds of characteristics just discussed are present for everyone. Whereas we would agree that these behaviors are a possibility for all, we would maintain that they are not the primary nor the most valued attributes in what we currently consider the model leader.

In concluding this discussion of women as deans, then, we would contend that many of the tendencies and perspectives just discussed *are* extremely valuable contributions and ways for a leader to behave. But we are also aware that they are for the most part considered less powerful ways to interact, often perilously close to a caricature of a "weak female" too concerned with others to make the "hard decisions." No work has been done that would support that hypothesis or any other about women as SCDE deans, and so until the data prove otherwise, it seems reasonable to suggest that these qualities might be sought after and encouraged in all deans rather than scorned in a few.

SUMMARY

The emergent picture of deans of minority status suggests that they bring particular skills, sensibilities, and insights to the SCDE that have been lacking or underemphasized. Over the past decade, a growing number of people of color and/or women have become SCDE deans. Still, when statistical comparisons are made—whether as a percentage of women with education doctorates who achieve deanships or a percentage of people of color with education doctorates who achieve deanships—it is immediately clear that both groups are underrepresented in leadership roles in SCDE's across the country. But the numbers are only a harbinger of the serious concerns raised when particular groups have been consistently excluded from a given arena of practice, one which carries certain levels of power and of privilege.

It is important to re-emphasize the connectivity between minorities and women deans. As newcomers arriving to leadership positions from an historical position of oppression, our sensitivity to struggle and empowerment issues tend to be much higher than those of traditional males. This sensitivity can be defined as nurturing or caring, a variable not considered as important as rationality or vision in popular texts on leadership. However, Mitchell and Scott (1987) report that a comprehensive review of studies on leadership reveals there is no consensus about what attributes make an administrator an expert or effective.

In a recent article on caring, Joan Lipsitz (1995) cogently argues that caring creates a culture that is essential for learning. She points out that a caring culture requires subtle changes in attitudes and scope. These changes are at the core of group collectivity shared by minorities and women. In our former social role as the primary provider of affectivity, we are socialized to value everyone in our social sphere and take responsibility for their progress. Obviously, a nurturing personality is essential to promoting today's faculty and students, given the increasing diversity of both groups. How we perceive nurturing challenges the reified notion of abstract criteria. As Blackmore (1989) stated, because women (and minorities) tend to assume responsibility for taking care of others as defined by traditional roles, they tend to pass judgments that are based on contextual rather than abstract criteria, focus more on process than outcome. Describing how minorities and women deans go about defining and resolving problems remains central to understanding effective leadership styles for today's community.

It is a core premise of this book that the thoughts and voices of those excluded are distinct. It is also our belief that, once heard, there is insight and new visions embedded in these voices. Just as we came to know more about racism from DuBois, more about the Holocaust from Anne Frank, so can we come to know more about the critical issues facing education from the chapters of this book.

—Louis A. Castenell
Jill M. Tarule

REFERENCES

Anderson, R., Heller, H., Algozzine, B., & Andette, R. (1992, Spring/Summer). Administrative practices of deans of colleges of education in selected institutions of higher education. *Record*, pp. 36–39.

Baker-Miller, J. (1976). *Toward a New Psychology of Women*. Boston: Beacon.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic.

Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smith (ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*. London: Falmer.

Bowker, L. (1982). The academic dean. *Teaching Sociology, 9* (3), pp. 257–271.

Castenell, L. A., Johnson, L., Gallagher, R., & Wheeler, G. (1994). The dean's role in encouraging cultural diversity: Perception from deans. (Unpublished paper).

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seaview.

Gardner, W. (1992). Once a dean: Some reflections. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43* (5), pp. 357–366.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldberger, N., Tarule, J. M., Clinchy, B., & Belenky, M. (eds.) (1996). *Knowledge, difference, and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic.

Jordan, J., Kaplan, A., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I., & Surrey, J. (1991). *Women's growth in connection: Writings from the stone center*. New York: Guilford.

Lipsitz, J. (1995). *Prologue*. Why should we care about caring.

Lyons, N. (1983). Two perspectives on self, relationships and morality. *Harvard Educational Review, 53*, pp. 125–145.

Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. K. (1994). *Inside feminist classrooms: An inside look at how professors and students are transforming higher education for a diverse society*. New York: Basic.

Martin, J. (1985). *Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of an educated woman*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Mitchell, T., & Scott, W. (1987, November/December). Leadership failures, the distrusting public, and prospects of the administrative state. *Public Administration Review*, pp. 445–452.

Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace*. Boston: Beacon.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine.

White, J., & Parham, T. (1990). *The psychology of blacks*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

part I

Changing Leadership: Tensions Within Academic and Social Roles

chapter 1

Surviving the Middle Passage: The Absent Legacy of African American Women Education Deans?

Beverly Lindsay
The Pennsylvania State University

> A long habit of not thinking a thing *wrong* gives it the superficial appearance of being *right*.
>
> —Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*

> There is a responsibility to be as honest and as candid as possible. We must be truth-tellers as much as it hurts.
>
> —Cornel West, interview with Wiley, 1993, p. 14

As the 21st Century rapidly approaches, the population in the United States is becoming more diverse. In many metropolitan public schools, over one-third of the students are minorities. Within the nations' foremost research universities, however, minorities are conspicuously absent especially in senior faculty and administrative positions. During the 1992–1993 academic year, for example, there were *not* minority women presidents in major research or comprehensive doctoral universities. Nor were there any minority women deans of education in comprehensive research universities, with the exception of Howard University, a preeminent Black university (American Council on Education, 1993; American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1990; Hodgkinson, 1992). Why does this reality exist, particularly in education where minorities earn most of their doctorates and hold faculty rank (National Center for Education Statistics, 1992, p. 280)?[1]

Perhaps a few illustrations of the search procedures for deans of education at what Carnegie classifies as Research I and II universities[2] (basically the top 100 or so research institutions) render some initial insight. During the 1992–1993 academic year, several education dean searches were conducted at Research I and II institutions. Some of these searches occurred at the University of Pittsburgh, Ohio State University, Michigan State University, Florida State University, University of Maryland, and University of Kansas. African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos or Chicanos were applicants, nominees, or interviewees at all these sites. Yet no minority became a dean at these or any other major research university.

In some instances, the search for deans produced some egregious situations. At the University of Pittsburgh, an African American woman was a finalist and received an express mail invitation to visit the campus (along with several other women professors and senior administrators from Research I colleges of education) for an interview. The search was then extended and the African American woman was "disinvited" without being informed. Two European American women were also disinvited. Supposedly, there were problems with the styles of these candidates. The search committee invited one European American woman and three European American men for interviews. One of the male interviewees, from an institution that had just achieved university status, was invited because several search committee members "believed he was Black in light of his resume and location in a rural southern state." Many at Pittsburgh expressed surprise when a blue-eyed European American male appeared. An offer was made eventually to the internal candidate, the interim dean who is an associate professor.

At the Ohio State University, two African Americans were interviewed as finalists. The search committee ranked three European American women as the top candidates and forwarded their names to the provost for a selection. One of the African Americans had been an education dean at one of the foremost Research I universities and held an endowed chair. The other African American candidate had senior line administration experiences in the Federal government (which included administering a prestigious interagency Fulbright program) *and* at the largest Research I college of education. When the African American candidates sought feedback on the search process, they were informed that there were problems with their "styles." The search committee's observations and reference calls to professionals (various referees had never worked with the candidates) indicated that one was supposedly too articulate, assertive, forthright, straightforward, and candid, while the other was ostensibly too retiring, quite, low-key, and soft-spoken. Very different styles netted the same result. The internal candidate (who had less than one year one year of senior college-wide line administrative experience) was selected.

At Michigan State University, the three finalists were an African American man, a European American woman, and a European American man. (I personally know six minority administrators who had held college or university-wide positions and thus received letters, telephone calls, or preliminary interviews "encouraging" their candidacy.) The African American candidate had been a dean in a comprehensive university, had obtained multimillion dollar grants and contracts, was regarded as a distinguished researcher, and held the presidency of the most prestigious professional education association for deans and other administrators in teacher education—namely, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The offer was made to the European American woman who was a department chair.

The search committee at Florida State University forwarded the names of a female and a male European American candidate from regional universities to central administration for a final selection. In neither case were these candidates nationally known for their administration, grants acquisition, or research. Other finalists included an African American woman who had been a dean at a Research I university. While the former withdrew her candidacy before the search committee forwarded names to central administration, concerns had surfaced about the styles of these two women.

These illustrations indicate that the search process may be a middle passage that few minorities have survived. The preceding illustrations raise some perplexing questions. Are there particular institutional barriers that are manifested via individual and group actions that impede the progress of minorities, especially women? Why have no minority women—African American, Asian American, Native American, or Chicana or Latina—ever become education deans at Research I universities? What unique issues confront women in their attempts to secure deanships? How do African American and European American women themselves perceive their career advancement and options? What are the differences? In short, has "academic terrorism," (to use a phrase coined by a colleague of the author) or components thereof, become a dominant force, in search processes and elsewhere in education colleges and universities?

These questions are raised in a period when the numbers of European American women deans in Research I and II institutions are increasing. For example, in 1992–1993 there were 12 European American women deans of education in Research I and II institutions, compared to none a decade earlier (American Council on Education, 1993 and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1993). Why is this relative success manifested, while in 1992–1993 there were no African American women deans in such research institutions? In fact, through 1994 only two African American women have ever been education deans in European American Research II institutions; none had been at Research I sites.

To begin providing responses to such fundamental questions, this chapter examines some conceptual frameworks to help provide insight on the multiple reasons for the absence of African American women in university executive positions as education deans. Manifestations of second generation racism and sexism are the central motifs explicated in the conceptual literature from political science, administration and management, sociology, and social psychology. Power, structural policies and conditions, stereotypes, prejudice, institutional climate, mentoring, and networking are pivotal variables posited via various disciplines (Gilliland, 1990; Hacker, 1992; Kanter, 1977; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989; Moore, 1984; Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, & Bragg, 1983; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987).

After discussing several conceptual tenets, the qualitative traditions espoused in seminal works by Bateson (1989), Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule (1986), Gilligan (1982), and Lorde (1984) are used *to elicit the voices of women as sources of knowledge and analysis* regarding the presence or absence of Black women as education deans. Thus interviews were conducted with three African American and three European American women who are or were education deans or an associate dean at Research I or II sites. The chapter concludes with forthright policy recommendations on ways to ensure the presence of African American women as education deans in Research I and II institutions.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS OF SECOND GENERATION RACISM AND SEXISM

Most professionals are familiar with the role of social science research in the 1954 landmark Supreme Court Decision *Brown v. Board of Education* decision declaring racial discrimination illegal. Fewer are aware of *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 1989* whereby social psychology findings pertaining to gender discrimination were used. In this case the Supreme Court declared: "An employer who objects to aggressiveness in women but whose position requires this trait places women in an intolerable Catch 22: out of a job if they behave aggressively and out of a job if they do not" (*Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 1989, pp. 1790–1791). When race and gender are both present, discrimination based on either or both can be at play. Subtle contemporary forms of racism and sexism, dormant in earlier generations, may be comprehended via the following types of research tenets.

In the highly acclaimed volume, *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*, Andrew Hacker (1992) paraphrases the central issues raised by Gunnar Myrdal in his classical work, *An American Dilemma*. The United States ostensibly commits to universal justice and equality; yet these lofty principles are continually contradicted by the treatment of African Americans. Moreover, contradictions are not a 20th Century phenomenon as witnessed in the late 18th and early 19th Centuries, when Thomas Jefferson espoused equality for all and simultaneously *hoped* that Blacks were equal.

According to Hacker (1992), the desire to maintain and enhance power is a basis for racism and subsequent discrimination. Central to power maintenance and enhancement is competition where there are winners and losers; but no European American can ever lose so much that he/she becomes Black because racism precludes this possibility. Three types of racism include that by individuals, that by institutions, and that of scientific or academic research. An example of individual racism is the taxi driver or college professor who refuses to treat African Americans similarly as the way European Americans are treated. Academic and other institutions maintain organizational structures and culture climates that prohibit the full participation of Blacks. Research and policies inhibit minority participation by explaining differences in terms of race or design measures which fail to examine culture differences. In all these illustrations, power enables racism and discrimination to continue. Hacker (1992) maintains that the consequence of racism is the consignment of some humans to marginal status and no white person can claim to have suffered in the same way as Blacks.

Within the work environment and elsewhere, European Americans are prohibited from engaging in some kinds of overt discrimination against African Americans. But it exists behind closed doors. Witness Hacker's (1992, p. 117) statement: "In more secluded settings, white employees and supervisors may be heard to say that they find Blacks hard to work with. We had one; but he didn't work out." The hiring and promotion of few Blacks, via racist practices, simply enables whites to maintain their power and positions. The status quo continues.

Kanter's seminal work *Men and Women of the Corporation* clearly articulates the centrality of power within formal organizations. The official and shadow political structures provide the mechanisms whereby power via resources is mobilized, distributed, and enlarged. Maintaining formal or informal positions within the power structure is the goal of most white men. Thus a male candidly stated, "It's okay for women to have these jobs, as long as they don't go zooming by me" (Kanter, 1977, p. 218). In short, his position and status must be maintained; thus, when some men report to a woman in a more powerful role, they often feel uncomfortable and threatened.

To maintain power, alliances with sponsors, peers, and subordinates are established and maintained. Sponsors often support and "fight" for someone. According to Kanter (1977) sponsors were exceedingly important for women because their alliances or network with peers are often limited than those for males. Sponsors could, in effect, bring women into networks and facilitate relations with subordinates. Although some women might assume managerial or executive positions, men would often limit the power and influence of women by casting them into stereotypic gender roles as mother, seductress, pet, or iron maiden. Nurturing and attending to emotional needs characterized the mother, whereas the seductress is a sex object and men vied for her attention or dismissed her contributions. Being the kid sister, buddy, or mascot who admired and supported men's accomplishments without entering into direct competition typified the pet. Finally, the iron maiden was the strong or tough woman who was candid and forthright in her dealings with others; therefore, she was viewed as threatening or dangerous. Men attempted to downgrade her stature and influence by distancing themselves from her and/or being exceedingly polite. Iron maidens were frequently trapped into being more militant than they were in reality (Kanter, 1977). In essence, individual prejudices became part of the cultural norms that were reinforced within the organizational structure as will be observed in the subsequent interviews with women deans.

In a special issue of the *Journal of Social Issues*, some of the nation's foremost sociologists and social psychologists, Jomills Henry Braddock (1987), James McPartland (1987), Thomas Pettigrew (1987), Susan Fiske (1987), and others examined fundamental conditions that inhibit the full participation of African Americans in the workforce. The two major themes were: 1) the salience of formal structures and subsequent policies; and 2) social psychological variables as manifested in prejudice, stereotyping, attributions, and the like. The first thesis basically examines macro level conditions, while the second focuses on micro level circumstances.

Although the lead journal article by Braddock and McPartland (1987) did not specifically focus on comprehensive research universities, important insights are presented. For example, major exclusionary barriers investigated in the research included: segregated networks when one is a candidate; information bias *and* statistical discrimination at the entry level; and closed internal markets at the promotion stage. When applicants are sought for positions outside the organization, often the ostensible practice in academe, positions are announced or posted. Informal social networks help bring candidates into the pool, which is certainly a practice for identifying candidates for deanships. Braddock and McPartland (1987) assert that segregated networks tend to exclude minorities. When minorities are identified by a broader network or other means, organizational policies and practices can still exclude them as witnessed vividly in the search process at Michigan State University. Or as was the case during Ohio State University's search for a dean, professional minorities were not in the social and professional network of European Americans from Ohio State. Thus, search committee members and others could call many European Americans from the home institutions of an African American finalist and never speak to a minority professional referee. Yet Ohio State could assure itself that it had obtained a wide range of views about the African American finalists whether referees had worked with the finalists or not. In short, segregated networks were exclusionary hurdles.

Statistical bias occurs when employees utilize negative group images rather than direct individual assessments. This usually means that a white will be chosen over an African American. As indicated by Braddock and McPartland (1987), it does not matter whether employer perceptions are based on group differences or uninformed group stereotypes for the highly qualified candidates, the exclusionary results are the same. Informational bias can occur when recommendations and references by African American's referees carry less weight than those of European American's. At the University of Pittsburgh search, the positive statements from African American and women referees were simply granted less weight when compared to the negative comments from European American male critics. In higher education, informational bias means that even when eminent minority colleagues are known, they are sometimes not contacted, as was the case for one minority finalist who was working directly with an African American male dean who was well-known by senior scholars and administrators at Ohio State University. A strict analog to Braddock and McPartland's (1987) concept of closed internal markets may not be readily evident in searches for deans. However, when there are internal candidates in the final pool, often the selection is not authentically open to external candidates, especially African Americans who are already hampered by the preceding three factors.

While Braddock and McPartland contend that intentional discrimination may be absent because the very structure and policies of organizations permit exclusion, individual perceptions and subsequent actions are also genuine realities. Thus, Pettigrew and Martin's (1987) social psychological frameworks illuminate how exclusion occurs via various forms. Modern or *second generation* manifestations are subtle, indirect, and even ostensibly non-racial in character. As Pettigew and Martin state:

> Often the black is the only person in a position to draw the conclusion that prejudice is operating...Whites have usually observed only a subset of the incidents, any *one* of which can be explained away by a nonracial account...Many whites remain unconvinced of the reality of subtle prejudice and discrimination, and come to think of their black co-workers as terribly touchy and overly sensitive. (p. 50)

In essence, negative racial stereotypes along with the "solo" and "token" roles are *triple jeopardy* confronted by African Americans. With negative racial stereotyping, the "ultimate attribution error" operates so that *biased* causal attributions are assigned to the performance of African Americans (the outgroup, while whites are the ingroup). That is, transitory factors—luck, special assistance, affirmative action, phenomenal supervisor—explain positive performances by African Americans. Negative performances are attributed to permanent factors such as inability, inadequate background, personality, and general incompetence. Yet success for European American men is due to permanent factors such as ability and competence, whereas failure is attributed to transit conditions such as temporary health problem (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987; Stephan, 1985).

Coupled with such biased attributions are the highly visible roles of the "solos" and "tokens." Solos are the only one *or* one of a few Blacks in a European American work setting; the tokens are the individuals who were supposedly employed due to affirmative action or some other special policy. Solos are often subject to magnified expectations and extreme evaluations (Fernandez, 1981; Kanter, 1977; Pettigrew & Martin, 1987). "Walking on water" or "not knowing where the lake is located" frequently characterizes solos. Even the water-walkers become tired and will regress periodically to average performance that is a disappointment to some allies who possess exaggerated expectations. Those who ostensibly do not know where the lake is located are probably comparable to their white counterparts. In either instance, the solos receive biased evaluations from supporters and detractors. Undoubtedly, this kind of prejudiced feedback reaches search committees when finalists have been the only African American line administrators in their institutional setting. The perception of tokens is that there is some level of incompetence, although their backgrounds and credentials may be equal or far superior to their white counterparts. *Triple jeopardy cannot be escaped.*

Explications from both social psychology and linguistics foster analysis of second-generation racism and sexism. North (1991) reviews linguistic research and her experiences as a dean regarding speaking and interaction in work settings. According to North's sources, individual and group perceptions and norms mean women are to listen more and speak less than men. Moreover, women who use the language comparable to men are judged differently, that is, more harshly than their male peers. A certain amount of deference is to be voiced in women's speech. In experiments and college meetings, it was demonstrated that if women spoke more than one-third of the time, they were viewed as domineering or overbearing. Thus a critical question for women administrators is: "Shall I remain silent and fail to voice concerns for my college or department, or should I risk being viewed as domineering?" One response is that faculty apparently want their college's views represented effectively within the university and to the public by a mute woman.

Women scholars such as Christiansen, Macagno-Shang, Staley, Stamler & Johnson (1989), Eberspacher and Sisler (1988), and Kaplan and Tinsley (1989) extract theses from administrative paradigms when examining gender roles. Organizational norms can prescribe the centrality of networks and mentors for potential and actual women administrators. As Christiansen et al. (1989, p. 58) assert, "Success in academia depend[s] not only on what you know but also who you know for support, guidance, and advocacy." A mentor is one who can play this role and introduce one to the networks of peers and senior administrators and colleges. According to Eberspacher and Sisler (1988) and Moore (1982), mentors may be the single most important factor in the career development of administrators. Mentors may be teachers (who enhance administrative leadership and intellectual skills), sponsors (who facilitate entry and mobility), hosts and guides (welcoming the novice into the profession), and exemplars (who serve as a model for emulation). If women do not have male mentors, they may be less likely to emulate "successful" covert tactics, which men often use. Women often engage in more overt strategies. Women may, in fact, be oblivious to covert tactics and associated administrative styles. Couple this with Bennis and Nanus's (1985) studies, which indicate that the administrative and management styles of men (whether assertive or retiring, articulate or inarticulate, or participative or autocratic) often did not preclude them from leadership positions. Perhaps part of the success of men's styles is evident because many strategies and decisions are not present in an open arena.

What various women scholars and administrators are beginning to assert is the need for emergent administrative and leadership paradigms (to introduce positive features of alternative executive styles) and simultaneously examine ensuing prototypes. Gilligan & Attanucci (1988), Lindsay and Parrott (1993), North (1991), and Rogers (1988) examine characteristics associated with male and female sociocultural roles that are transferred to administrative positions. If administrative leadership is envisioned as the ability to gain colleagues and staff support and compliance with shared organizational goals, then competitiveness, dominance, winning, and reliance on strict rational objectives—that is, characteristics associated with men—may not be the most viable options. Cooperativeness, partnerships, team building, intuition, and feeling—traits linked to women—may be feasible alternatives. Blending both types of characteristics into androgynous leadership styles may ultimately prove the most successful. Unfortunately, this may not be an immediate reality because, as discussed earlier, European American men are often unwilling to relinquish their dominant positions and roles.

THE VOICES OF WOMEN

So far, this conceptual discussion of several disciplines reveals substantial factors that illustrate how African Americans and women were excluded from entering deanships in Research I and II institutions. The voices of African American and European American women should make the prior analysis come alive as they describe in their careers.

On the surface, the late poet Audrey Lorde (1984), educational psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982), anthropologist Mary Catherine Bateson (1989), and educational researchers Mary Field Belenky and her colleagues (1986) and Johnetta Cole (1993) appear to have little in common. However, their exceptionally lucid poetry, writings, and research rely on the "actual voices of women" as an authentic method of gaining new knowledge and engaging in subsequent action. Thus Lorde (1984, p. 40) stated "I have come to believe...that what is most important to me must be spoken and shared." In paraphrasing her daughter she further stated:

> You're never really a whole person if you remain silent, because there's always that one little piece inside you that wants to be spoken out...and if you don't speak it out one day it will just up and punch you in the mouth from the inside. (p. 42)

Or as Belenky et al. (1986) declared:

> Attempts to blind the "seeing knower" have made it difficult for the scientist and the philosopher to acknowledge the role the knower plays in the construction of knowledge. Only now is there [more] widespread recogni-

> tion of the importance of putting the knower back into the known as [we] come to understand how *intentional blindness limits what one can see with the mind's eye.* [emphasis added] (p. 19)

Thus the voices of women are elicited through conversations and dialogues.

This author built on these traditions by engaging in structured interviews in 1992 and 1993 with two African American women who had been education deans in Research II universities *and* one who was an Associate Dean at a Research I site (within the past three years) and had recently interviewed for deanships. Three European American women who had assumed the education deanship within the past three years at Research I and II sites were also interviewed. The European American women were selected from the Northeast, Midwest, and South to ensure some geographical representativeness; no white women occupied comparable deanships on the West Coast. The African American women were selected because they represented the only professionals who had held such roles or were poised to assume such a role.

An interview schedule was developed to elicit and compare the voices, responses, and experiences of African American and European American women. To ensure anonymity, fictional names are used for all universities. The European American women were located at Star University, Keystone University, and Midwestern University. African American women were located at Mountain University, Central University, and Peach University.

Question: What types of educational credentials or qualifications prepared you for your current position?

Four of the respondents had Ph.D. degrees in educational administration, child development and curriculum, counselor education, and teacher education. One had an Ed.D. in educational psychology, and one had both the Ph.D. in administration and management and the Ed.D. in comparative sociology of higher education. Five of the women earned their doctorates from the top twenty Research I institutions. One earned the doctorate from a Research II site where the particular doctoral program was regarded among the top five in the world. In short, the formal degree attainments among African American and European American women were comparable, although one Black woman had more formal qualifications with her second doctorate. They earned doctorates from "la creme de la creme" of American universities.

Question: Did you participate in a fellowship or similar program that contributed to your current role?

Two of the African American women participated in national fellowship programs, namely the American Council on Education Government Fellowship and the Institute of Educational Management at Harvard University. None of the European American women participated in a formal fellowship program. Hence in this regard the formal credentials of two African Americans exceeded those of European American women.

Question: Did you have mentors? If so, what roles did they play?

The professional from Mountain University stated that she had both African American and European American female and male mentors. A first was a European American female professor who helped her obtain her first postdoctoral position at a Research I university. In that position, a Black and a white male assisted her by removing obstacles and introducing her to the sources of power, that is, the provost and president of the university. The president and provost knew the person on a first name basis and later assisted her in becoming chair of two departments at that university. Later they were instrumental in her obtaining the deanship at Mountain University.

The professional from Central University is in another education deanship where the president of the university is African American. He hired her and has continually engaged in formal and informal discussions with her. Earlier in her career, several mentors were white males. One served as her dissertation advisor while she also served as his graduate teaching and research assistant. Assisting her to comprehend counselor education was this mentor's primary contribution. In an early postdoctoral position, a white male encouraged her research and coauthored papers with her. In a former deanship, a European American provost was very supportive of her as a dean and a Black woman in an urban environment.

The professional from Peach University stated that her first European American male dissertation advisor was instrumental in helping her to secure a fellowship to conduct field research in an African nation. Later he helped her obtain her first faculty assignment by strongly recommending her to one of his colleagues. An African American male in the Federal government helped her obtain a Federal assignment and introduced her to various government professionals. An informal mentoring alliance emerged between the African American women and a vice president at her home university, which enabled her to obtain a second senior government assignment while remaining affiliated with a foremost Research I institution. In her current assignment, she does not identify a mentor.

The dean from Star University stated that she had four significant mentors: two European American women and men. The first woman was a nurturing person. The dean stated, "I was a single parent with four children, teaching full time, and pursuing my Ph.D. My soul was nurtured by my mentor. She helped me obtain a teaching fellowship so I could pursue fulltime study." A second woman mentor helped the Star dean critically examine her research—individual differences in learning between boys and girls. One male mentor helped her develop her statistical skills and the ability to test questions and ideas, whereas the second helped her conceptualize issues in their social context and to write lucidly.

The dean at Keystone University identified two mentors: a European American woman and a man. The woman mentor helped the dean (in a previous position) understand her work—how the trauma of hospitalization should be viewed at the individual and systemic levels in relationship to treatment. During her doctoral studies, a male served as an intellectual mentor who truly respected her work and collaborated with her. This was critical because there was a seven-year gap between the master's and doctoral study. Unfortunately, this mentor later stole some of her work, published it, and gave only minimal acknowledgement of her theoretical contributions. Neither mentor helped in post-doctoral positions.

Several mentors assisted the dean from Midwestern University. Being open, sharing inside information, and providing tutelage were major illustrations of mentoring by senior university officials who tremendously assisted this woman. For this dean, this process started when she was a graduate assistant in a former dean's office where she drafted policy documents, wrote speeches, shadowed the dean, and participated in confidential meetings. These same activities continued when a dean later appointed her to faculty and administrative staff positions in the college after she completed her doctorate. Encouraging her ideas and enabling her to implement ideas also occurred. She also had several peer mentors who were women and men administrators within her home institution and at other Research I and II institutions. Peer mentors "mentored" each other and opened networks to other men and women.

Patterns seem to emerge. All the African American and European American women had mentors in graduate school. For the Black women, these mentors helped facilitate their post-doctoral entry into a university. Mentors also helped them obtain positions at other institutions. When they did not have strong sponsors they did not obtain various positions—unless the provost or president was willing to take a balanced perspective on the negative comments about them—because they were not integrally included in the "old boys and girls networks." For two of the European American women, mentors significantly influenced their lives because they were mothers with family responsibilities. However, these mentors did not play critical roles in their obtaining their first postdoctoral positions. Networks and the weight of reference letters helped enable them to obtain initial and subsequent postdoctoral positions. Only two of these deans had mentors play the various roles often cited between male administrators and their protégés. It was an "open secret" that a political sponsor (to use Eberspacher & Sisler's, 1988, and Kanter's, 1977, term) chaired the search committee when she was selected for the permanent deanship. This also helps to explain her mobility within one institution, in contrast to the other women, who have all been at several universities.

Question: What are two or three of your most salient prior administrative experiences that contributed to your current position?

The African American women cited several prior line administrative positions that contributed to their being deans. One was an elementary school principal, director of a Head Start program, and chaired two departments in schools of education *and* business before becoming a dean. Another had been a department head and a dean of a graduate school before becoming an education dean. The third held senior administrative positions in the Federal government administering interagency programs and engaging in national and international grants management.

One European American woman began as a grants manager, started her own company (with a multi-million dollar budget), and served as a department chair before becoming a dean. A second had been a dean of an outreach graduate program, dean of an academic division, and a special assistant to a president before assuming her current role. The third had served for about six months as an associate dean and had served in a staff position coordinating undergraduate programs for several years before she became a dean.

Overall, the African American women and two of the European Americans had extensive administrative experiences at several institutions that prepared them for their deanships. One woman had significantly less senior administrative experience than the others, but she advanced within the same institution where her key mentors were employed.

Question: As an African American or European American woman dean, what factors would you identify that affect you positively due to gender and race or ethnicity? Those that affect you negatively? How do you incorporate them into your ongoing administrative roles?

When queried about positive features, one African American woman stated: "There are lots of do-gooders. They like for you to *become their cause* so they will introduce you to certain circles." Being a Black woman also enabled her to reach out to the community and promote diversity; she could then influence hiring along gender and diversity. She could also insist on "quality" because subtle perceptions of whites meant that they did not expect quality. Negative features included her having to overcome constant gender and ethnic bias so she could then try to become a key player in informal structures where real decisions are made. *Her ideas were often viewed as "legitimate" only when white colleagues re-stated them as their own.* The positive and negative features had to be in the forefront of her administrative roles because they were permanent realities.

A second Black woman stated that her gender enabled her to provide a nurturing kind of leadership that men do not know. She said, "I hug other faculty and colleagues." In her deanship in an urban environment, race was a positive feature since trust could be established fairly easily in the community, school systems, and with urban students. Race also enabled her to make decisions about minority and disadvantaged students that faculty would not question so quickly. After all, "she knows about them." Negative features included the reality that many faculty and other colleagues would "prefer not to have a minority and a woman dean." Other university deans sometimes discounted her statements because she is a minority woman, soft-spoken, and an education dean. She declared, "The old boys network is alive and well; yet I do not let people get away with things. And there is resentment." Engaging in shared governance with the faculty and the unions through fair and honest dialogues was a key method for incorporating favorable and unfavorable realities into her administrative position.

A third African American woman stated that race was often positive when dealing with international and minority colleagues and students since it was believed that "she would probably understand them [internationals and minorities] better than some whites. After all, she knows what it means to be from another culture." Some liberal European Americans genuinely sought her input on various issues and would try to empathize when they stated, "it must be difficult being a minority and woman on the Executive Council of the College." Negative features are similar to those voiced by other African American women deans. The good old boys and girls network is alive and growing in her university. She attended meetings of women faculty where discussions revolved around the absence of senior women college administrators. In various instances, she was not recognized as a senior administrator; they meant "white women administrators." The legitimacy of her role is not acknowledged nor recognized since she is a minority woman. As one vice president told her, "deans and other administrators make many decisions that affect the lives of other people;" thus, she realized many university faculty, staff, and students simply do not want a minority woman affecting or "controlling" their lives. Engaging in what she terms "collegial diplomacy" is her method of dealing with positive and negative features. Frequently, collegial diplomacy does not work because some often assume that diplomacy means only acknowledging positive features and not addressing negative ones.

The dean from Star University stated that as a woman she can "go to the caring, feeling, and nurturing levels. I can promote growth and facilitate activities as a woman. I often observe and wait before speaking in meetings. I am interested in win–win." As the first woman dean in her university, other deans treat her in a courtly fashion so they listen to her ideas. Since this dean is very mature chronologically, many negative features occurred over twenty years earlier in her career. For example, in her position as a grants manager, often she had difficulty getting her ideas accepted; and some men would say, "Isn't she cute?" These conditions contributed to her leaving that organization and beginning her own company. Being an education dean is sometimes a negative feature since "education is low on the totem pole." Her maturity and the fact that her college brings in several million a year in external funding enables her to function effectively as a dean.

At Keystone University the dean is often selected for "token" reasons to participate in many campus-wide activities. As the token participant she, "expresses her views by acknowledging and working with relationships among people. Emergence of *alternative* leadership is occurring. I have the skills to make sense of relationships with people and programs." The token status also produces negative effects because she has multiple assignments which are sometimes hard to juggle. There is also the risk of being viewed as a *one issue* administrator, that is, women's issues only. She is cognizant of the positive and negative features, but recognizes that "minority status as a woman is a secondary issue since she shares the same race as white men." Hence her race and her mature years enable her to administer in a university where men have most leadership roles.

For the dean at Midwestern University, positive features included using her status as a woman dean to "step up to the mike and articulate the views of women." There are efforts on the part of various people to be helpful. Negative features emerge when she may not have the support of other women and minorities. At this writing, the dean is still discerning how to incorporate the positive and negative features in her repertoire.

For all the African American women constants include: the presence of closed networks; their being viewed as the iron maidens (and for one, sometimes a motherly role); the questioning of the legitimacy of their ideas, roles and authority; and their status as Black women and subsequent linkages with underrepresented groups. European American women expressed their roles as facilitators—sometimes associated with the mother role (as discussed by Kanter, 1977)—especially since they were mature. The view of one as a "pet" who had to move when she no longer wanted to be viewed in this manner *and* their token representation on university-wide endeavors were voiced concerns. In contrast to the African American women, white women did not have the same types of features and constant pressures of race and gender influencing every action. To paraphrase the statement of the Keystone professional, *gender is secondary when race is present.*

Questions: What particular problems/issues (temporarily or permanently) impeded your career as a dean, associate dean, department chair, or similar position? Salient issues/factors? How did you address the issues/factors? What do you do when your supervisor or the person to whom you report does not support you? When similar issues/factors occurred for European American males and/or females, what was the result or outcome? Why do you think this was the reality? What would you recommend to another minority female in a comparable situation?

The professional from Mountain University stated that some faculty constantly tried to undermine her. It was important for her to recognize and articulate "what I was brought in to do, that is, to be a change agent. Some faculty did not want change. So I bore the brunt of faculty hostilities which were vented toward me." She hired about 35% of the faculty during her tenure as dean and had to work constantly to ensure that new hires "were not socialized by enemies." A difficult, yet mitigating, factor was her working with four different provosts; so deans had considerable autonomy. In this regard, she was comparable to other deans who also had to work with new provosts every year or so. She and other minority women, in particular, had to quickly build support systems during the "window of opportunity" which are internal and external to the college and university. These support systems were critical as she was attacked by faculty and accounts of her actions appeared in the public media.

The dean at Central University experienced temporary career impediments as she raised her family and attended to her marriage. Her early roles were also used by some to justify their views that she could not assume some professional positions. Gender and race were constant impediments. Other early impediments included an acting vice president (to whom she reported) refusing to support various endeavors and thus decreasing the financial allocations for her office. An administrative assistant also undermined her and reported the dean's activities to the acting vice president. In a later administrative position, a dean of faculty did not support her faculty hiring efforts. At Central University, the education dean was in an institution where there were eight provosts in approximately ten years. Thus, there was a chance to be a strong dean coupled with the tension of adjusting to new provosts. Dealing with different provosts was a factor affecting all deans at Central University which had several minority deans. When asked, "what would you recommend to another minority female in a comparable position?" the Central University dean stated: "Analyze whose doing what and why; be astute and ruthless, and cut losses quickly, that is, don't give people two or three chances; use administrative power to get rid of people as necessary; begin to think of another position; and see if the provost/president is supportive."

The professional from Peach University stated that "impediments abound. The clearest indicator is the fact that every single minority within that college of education has been denied somewhere along the tenure and/or promotion process." While several of the negative decisions did not stand, the harsh effects are still there. So, operating in an atmosphere where the minority faculty are constantly undervalued is difficult. She continues: "After all, these same conditions are played out in various ways for a minority woman administrator." In addition, the dean, to whom she reports, seems to be unable to work successfully with various college administrators for more than one or two years unless she constantly agrees with him and supports his questionable tactics to undermine or strip professionals (including those with very legitimate concerns) of their assignments. For example, the home department for the Peach woman administrator had five department heads within a six year period. Translating negative views of the dean to the associate deans is a reality. When the dean accepted an interim assignment, he managed to find major negative comments about all highly qualified senior college administrators (all of whom were European American males, but one), except his original (privately stated) choice. Maintaining consistent support for his administrative team simply did not occur. Trying to establish and maintain close ties with other influential minorities who are within and external to the university, continuing to perform in a professional manner, engaging in sound administration and scholarship, participating in meetings and activities sponsored by European Americans, and engaging in recreational or cultural activities that are not associated with the university were her recommendations to other minority women.

The professional from Star University discussed several problems which impeded her career during the last thirty or more years. At one site, her ideas were consistently questioned and not taken seriously, although she continued to generate external funds. Her research teams were constantly dismantled And she was viewed as being "cute." Gender discrimination was the reality. So, she left and began her own company. In her faculty role at another university, she attempted to establish programs to teach and work with inner city teachers; these attempts were not supported by colleagues. Her networks enabled her to leave and assume the chairship of a department at another comprehensive university. As a chair for several years, she felt she had reached the "peak of her ideas" and was not receiving the desired support from college executives. Within weeks of resigning her administrative position she was sought as a candidate for her current deanship, a position she had no plans of pursuing. All her university moves were possible due to her network of colleagues, associates, and friends. The Star University dean said, "I don't know exactly what I would recommend to a minority woman. Questions can be raised. Would it be better to stay and fight, in cases like mine? Probably not." The response really depends on the institution, it is situationally bound.

The dean from Keystone University stated that her career was initially impeded because she did not have a doctorate, and decided to pursue one about seven years after completing the masters. A major "temporary" impediment occurred in a previous position where she served as the special assistant to a white woman president. As the special assistant she believed in loyalty, hard-work, and positive outcomes. Somewhere along the way the apparent perceptions and expectations changed between the special assistant and the president which "ended in a convoluted mess." Rather than remain in a dysfunctional role and cause disruptions to the system, the special assistant returned to a faculty role, remained silent and became depressed. Through her networks and with faculty support, she assumed an interim deanship within a year at the same institution. Later, she was *recruited* for her current deanship.

Since similar problems have occurred for other European American women, the Keystone dean stated that "there is a phase of re-balancing and acknowledging that she might not be *the problem*. Women tend to blame themselves. A move outside the role and often intervention via therapy is necessary." This same type of issue could be present and magnified for minority women administrators. Women administrators, in general, must try to avoid being perceived as an one-issue administrator, acknowledge competition by oneself and others, and recognize that women have often spent a lifetime of putting others first. She concluded by stating, "I wouldn't dream to presume about minority women and how issues and problems specifically face them."

According to the Midwestern University dean, she experienced constraints because she was "place-bound" by her martial status. Later, she was mobile but did not have to move since she assumed a deanship at her home institution. At one point in her career, she did not receive support from a previous dean and thus did not secure administrative promotions. The absence of mobility and the failure to select women as department heads are issues for many women. White women deans are supported by their supervisors and peers which may not be the case for minority women who are *or* desire to be deans. No specific recommendations were offered regarding minority women.

As usual, the African American women were constantly confronted with racism and sexism. Moreover, they were in institutions undergoing severe stress caused by the frequent change of executives in central administration or within the college. Being undermined by key administrators and faculty was another reality. Only one European American woman witnessed overt sexism as heard in verbal comments like "Isn't she cute?" That is, her demeanor and ideas could place her in the role of pet as described by Kanter (1977). When the several European American women encountered impediments within the academic environment, it appears that one level, rather than multiple ones, accentuated the dominant problems. For example, when there were problems with administrators, some faculty support was evident or vice versa. Two of the white women resigned administrative roles and assumed an equal or more senior one within a year due to faculty support and/or networks. In contrast, the African American women encountered multiple problems simultaneously, thereby suggesting that there are *institutional problems of racism and sexism* at all levels (Cole, 1993).

Question: When you interviewed for your current position how did you address the following: a) areas where you did not have administrative experience; b) areas where you had not conducted research or served as a consultant; c) your immediate supervisor or others making negative comments about you; d) your colleagues and others at your home institution or elsewhere making negative comments about you?

The deans at Mountain University and Central University stated that there were some disciplines within education, such as teacher education, that were not in their immediate backgrounds. Becoming involved with the Holmes Group (a national consortium of Research I and II institutions that focus on teacher education) and engaging in extensive discussions with faculty in the respective areas were their responses. For one dean, moving from a small private college to a comprehensive university was a concern during her interviews; so she discussed her numerous experiences at large comprehensive universities. Both deans stated that they constantly emphasized scholarship, research, and visions for the college. For the professional from Peach University, there was concern about her moving from the Federal government to a university. She had to explain, sometimes with limited success, that her range of comprehensive administrative experiences at the national and international level could be used effectively within the college. She raised fundamental questions about areas with which she was unfamiliar; many appeared surprised that "she had the ability to know which critical questions to raise." For the three women, it was only later that they learned about the types of negative comments that were being made about them. In one case, the home supervisor never provided an evaluation for the professional; yet he periodically complained to others and, thus, collective negative statements were provided to search committees. Clearly stating "what she was brought in to do and the resultant problems" was an interview tactic used by one dean.

For the two senior European American women, they simply stated that they did not have experiences in particular areas and sometimes said, "I don't know." Both indicated that they listened to negative comments about themselves and tried to learn from them. One, who is a therapist, said:

> Some negative comments have been enormously accurate. I have a high tolerance for ambiguity and that frustrates some people. In my current position, I sometimes wonder whether I am a nurse on a hospital stress ward or a dean at a university. So, I let people vent their frustrations.

The third woman acknowledged that she did not have much experience in budget and finance and that all her experiences had been in one institution. Trying to emphasize her experiences in national organizations and consulting with other schools were discussed as illustrations of her broader experiences. She also stated that people called from other institutions and told her "how the interview went. But, I try to rely only on comments directed to me and have open forums for discussion."

What is striking is that age seems to enable mature European American women to acknowledge openly areas where they do not have experience or are not knowledgeable. For the African American women, many white faculty seemed surprised that they were very experienced and knowledgeable, or that they asked penetrating questions. Negative stereotyping, as discussed by Pettigrew and Martin (1987), meant that white professionals and others "assumed that minority women would not be prepared for deanships." White women were able to use the informal aspects of networks to obtain feedback on their interviews and what colleagues from home institutions were saying. That is, the closed segregated networks as discussed by Braddock and McPartland (1987) appeared operative.

Question: What reasons would you cite for there having been only two African American women education deans in European American Research II institutions? Do you know of other African American (or other minority) women who did not become deans? If so, what factors impeded their progress?

The three African American women all stated that many European American men and women are often uncomfortable working with African American or any minority women in an executive position. The old boy's network enables them to continue devising ways, often very subtle within the search process and in the general academic milieu, to exclude minority women. The Mountain University dean declared, "If a woman follows another women, it is very difficult to hire her and then for her to administer effectively. *If nothing (concrete) can be found, then it's style. When people don't like you, they say its your style.*" Limiting opportunities to obtain prerequisite experiences also keeps minority women from becoming deans. Very few are department chairs or assistant or associate deans. And finally, some African American women, as with any women, are preoccupied with their domestic responsibilities and cannot make career choices that would lead to administrative positions.

Some of the comments by the deans at Star and Keystone Universities were quite similar to those of the African American women. The Star dean asserted, "The old boys! People in charge choose people like themselves." Comments from the Keystone dean included: "White males are open to one of their kind. They would rather have a white female or then a minority male. Academe is embedded in prejudice and oppressive practices." She further discussed the longer access of European American women via their doctorates and other relevant experiences to senior administrative experiences (which was also a view expressed by the Midwestern dean). She concluded by saying:

> *White women are culturally and physically part of the majority culture. Women of color are marginalized. It is erroneous to assume that problems of white and black women are quite alike and not different. Gender is easier to address than race. Racism is alive and well!* (emphasis added)

These quotes crystallize dominant reasons so few minority women have become education deans at Research II institutions and none at Research I sites in the early 1990s. Hacker's (1992) analysis on marginal status is apropros.

Question: Do you envision a more senior or comprehensive administrative experience? What type? What kind of institution?

Two of the African American women would like to become president or chancellor in a comprehensive university. They recognize that it will likely not be at a Research I or II site. The third woman prefers an executive position in central university administration, Federal government, or national or international organizations.

All the European American women stated that they did not envision a more senior administrative experience, although the one who had just assumed the deanship left that future possibility open. It is also notable that the more mature women had not planned to be deans; deanships occurred as options when they were well into their career.

These views of careers and future options suggest that African American women are more focused in their desires for senior administrative positions, but factors beyond them clearly limit their options. The glass ceiling means that if these options become realities they will likely be in comprehensive, rather than major research, universities or outside academe.

Question: Are there issues or areas that were not covered in our interviews and discussions that you would like to address?

Two of the African American and two of the European American women provided further comments on style. They indicated that a "feminine" style is often expected of them; yet male colleagues expected to engage, simultaneously, in "masculine" styles while interacting. The European American women believed that after some time, their nurturing, cooperative, and caring styles were acknowledged. Both contended that alternative leadership styles and paradigms are needed for college administration. Again, their maturity and seniority may have been factors so they could be both "mothers" and leaders simultaneously. The African American woman from Mountain University contended that whatever styles are used, style becomes a substitute for other problems that are plaguing faculty and administrators. Another African American woman encountered men who had considerable difficulty when she interacted with them in a style comparable to what they used with her. Thus, she was viewed as too assertive and straightforward when she would openly state, "I can play hard ball too." She was using the language of men and not showing deference (North, 1991); thus, men felt threatened and shifted the problem to her.

While women and minorities may desire to remain in the deanship pipelines, the dean from Keystone believed that for women, "it is clear that there are informal communication networks that females are not privy to." So, it might be argued that while more European American women are in the pipeline and have some access to networks, informal communications are still hindering their progress. If not, their presence would be seen in Research I and II institutions on the West Coast. Informal communication networks will be an even more pronounced deterrent for minority women.

The Midwestern University dean states that current fiscal constraints and other limitations in academe mean that many qualified professionals will not want to assume leadership positions. This may be especially the case when the public, private sectors, and parents all voice criticism against public schools *and* colleges and universities which prepare professionals for public schools. Hence there may be a leadership vacuum caused by an increasingly smaller pool of candidates—male or female, black or white.

ALTERING THE COURSE OF THE PASSAGE

A careful examination of the preceding discussions clearly portrays the interactive linkages between macro level conditions—institutional racism, structural conditions and policies, organizational environment, and segregated social and professional networks—and micro level conditions such as stereotyping, prejudice, and attributions. For African American women, this means that multiple racism and sexism are constant exclusionary barriers in their professional lives. Thus, search processes and related academic circumstances and procedures are middle passages that few have successfully sailed enroute to education deanships in Research I and II universities. To extend this metaphor, African American women are still at sea while European American women have landed and have begun constructions on shore via their deanships. But, Black women have not drowned at sea!

To help ensure safe landing, the ship's course must be altered. The following recommendations focus specifically on what should occur at the institutional and individual faculty levels:

1. There must be clear recognition and acknowledgement that a problem exists. As Dearmin (1992), Fernandez (1981), Hacker (1992), Kanter (1977), and Lindsay (1988) illustrate there is often a denial

of exclusionary conditions by those in power. A recognition of the problem would mean altering the power structure so the roles of European Americans are transformed. To alter the roles so that the contributions of all—including minority women—can enhance the university. Several endeavors can be undertaken. In depth seminars, workshops, and institutes can help identify the problems (and their manifestations) and then professionals can design institutional specific modes of redress.

2. Ensuring that *both the spirit and letter* of federal and state laws and institutional policies must be enforced continuously and consistently. This adherence must permeate the entire university structure. Holding all line administrators, from chancellors and presidents to department chairs and directors, accountable via evaluations must be a reality. This procedure helps explain how the African American male education deans at the Pennsylvania State University and the University of Kentucky have among the highest number of minority faculty in Research I education colleges anywhere in the nation, despite their locations in rural locales or small cities where supposedly "minorities do not want to live."
3. Fair evaluations at the home institution and the one where candidacy is sought must be insured. This means that fair and equitable criteria must be developed and then applied evenly. The same kind of information must be used for all professionals. For example, when search committee members develop the list of questions for referees, all questions must be asked and the same type of follow-up clarification requested. Too often discrepant and disjointed information is received on candidates. The search committees need to ask what type of formal evaluations are given at the home institution. If the evaluations are quite different, as they likely will be in various instances for minorities, then these discrepancies must be clearly taken into account.
4. Various types of professional experiences must be given credence and weight during the search process. For example, line administrative positions in hospitals, private companies, federal government, national associations, and the like should be viewed comparable to traditional education line positions such as department heads and program directors. Often women have vital experiences in various arenas as seen by the cases in this chapter.
5. Probing questions must be asked. For example, if an African American woman holds a professorship and director's position in a university where no other (or only a few) minority women have held such positions, the search committee must keep in mind how the incumbent may be viewed. After all, she occupies what Pettigrew and Mar-

tin (1987) and Kanter (1977) termed a solo and token position; thus the formal and informal evaluations of her will not be comparable to that of a European American male occupant.

6. The illustrations pertaining to leadership and management styles, cited by women in this chapter and identified in the literature, must be acknowledged and given credence. Women, as men, have a variety of styles which do not preclude effectiveness. The negative stereotypes associated with articulate, straightforward, nurturing, or sympathetic styles, when portrayed by women must be eliminated. Gilligan (1988), Hersey and Blanchard (1982), and Rogers (1988) expound the positive features of various leadership styles.

And finally, alliances with community and political groups can help ensure the fair representation of African American women and other minorities in executive positions such as education deanships. Constructive input and pressure from the minority communities in Tucson and Tempe, Arizona helped ensure that minority men were selected as president and dean of education at the Research I and II universities in the respective cities.

What must not be forgotten is that today's African American women professionals *are the survivors of the original middle passage.* They are not going to die in the bowels of academe via delays caused by middle passages such as search committees and related procedures enroute to executive positions. They intend to land and begin constructions via deanships. They intend to play pivotal roles to ensure that policies and procedures, such as those just articulated, place us or our protegés in executive positions. Their contributions and legacies to authentic democracy can no longer be absent in universities!

NOTES

[1] At the time the research was conducted (in 1992 and 1993) and at the time the chapter was originally submitted to the editors, the 1987 Carnegie classification was in effect. However, since then there have been changes in the number of Research I and II universities. For example, some Research II universities are now Research I and some Doctoral I universities have become Research II. Although, there have been slight changes made in the numbers of minority women who hold Deanships in Research I or II universities, the issues discussed and brought to bear on the situation remain the same.

[2] The Carnegie Classification of universities and colleges designates institutions from Research I to two year community or junior colleges. The Research I institutions are the foremost universities based upon criteria such as awarding at least 50 doctorates each year, at least $33.5 in external grants and contracts pri-

marily for research, a comprehensive curriculum to include graduate and professional education and expansive undergraduate offerings. Over 50 institutions are classified as Research I; the next 50 or so institutions are classified as Research II which generate between $12.5 and $33.5 million in grants and contracts. The ivy League institutions, major state and comprehensive land grant university (exceptions include the Universities of Rhode Island and Vermont), a few private ones such as New York University and the University of Southern California, and select state-related ones such as the University of Pittsburgh and the University of Cincinnati are Research I institutions. Howard University is the only African American Research I institution. Comprehensive urban sites such as Wayne State and Arizona State *and* other public institutions such as Florida State, and Texas A&M are Research II universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987).

REFERENCES

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. (1990). *Teacher education pipeline: Schools, colleges, and departments of education enrollment by race and ethnicity.* Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1993, May). [Interviews with David Imig and Mary Dilworth. Office of Executive Director and Office of Research. AACTE. Washington, D.C.]. Unpublished interviews.

American Council on Education. (1993, May & June). [Interviews with D. Shavlik & J. Touchton, Office of Women in Higher Education. ACE, Washington, D.C.]. Unpublished interviews.

Bateson, M.C. (1989). *Composing a life.* New York: Plume.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies of taking charge.* New York: Harper and Row.

Braddock, J.H., & McPartland, J.M. (1987). How minorities continue to be excluded from equal employment opportunities: Research on labor market and institutional barriers. *Journal of Social Issues, 43*(1), 5–39.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, et al., Supreme Ct, United States Reports, Vol. 349. October, 1954, p. 294. United States Government Printing Office, Washington: 1955.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning. (1987). *A Classification of institutions of higher education.* Lawrenceville, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Christiansen, M.D., Macagno-Shang, L., Staley, K.H., Stamler, V.L., & Johnson, M. (1989). Perceptions of the work environment and implications for women's career choice: A survey of university faculty women. *The Career Development Quarterly, 38,* 57–64.

Cole, J. (1993). *Conversations: Straight Talk with America's Sister President.* New York: Doubleday & Company.

Dearmin, E. (1992, February). Dean searches don't always work—Why not? In a symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, Texas.

Eberspacher, J. & Sisler, G. (1988). Mentor relationships in academic administration. *Initiatives, 51*(4), 27–32.

Fernandez, J.P. (1981). *Racism and sexism in corporate life: Changing Values in American business.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Fiske, S.T. (1987). On the road: Comment on the cognitive stereotyping literature in Pettigrew and Martin. *Journal of Social Issues, 43*(1), 113–118.

Fiske, S.T. & Taylor, S.E. (1991). *Social Cognition.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34,* 223–37.

Gilliland, J.R. (1990). Beyond affirmative action: Leadership diversity that works. *Initiatives, 53*(1), 21–24.

Hacker, A. (1992). *Two nations: Black and white, separate, hostile, unequal.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1992). *A Demographic Look at Tomorrow.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kaplan, S. & Tinsley, A. (1989). Women in administration of higher education. *The Education Digest, 55*(4), 24–27.

Lindsay, B. (1988). Public and higher education policies influencing African American women. *Higher Education, 17,* 563–580.

Lindsay, B. & Parrott, J. (1993). Review of *Perspectives on minority women in higher education* by Lynne Brodie Welch (ed.) Praeger, New York: 1992. In *Higher Education,* Vol. 25, No. 2: 511–513.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider.* Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Moore, K.M. (1982). The role of mentors in developing leaders for academe. *Educational Record, 63,* 23–28.

Moore, K.M. (1984). Careers in college and university administration: How are women affected? *New Directions in Higher Education, 45,* 5–15.

Moore, K.M., Salimbene, A.M., Marlier, J.D., & Bragg, S.M. (1983). The Structure of Presidents' and Deans' Careers. *Journal of Higher Education, 54*(5), 500–515.

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1992). *Digest of education statistics: 1992* (GPO No. 065-000-00532-8). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

North, J.D. (1991). Strangers in a strange land: Women in higher education administration. *Initiatives, 54,* 43–53.

Paine, T. (1994). *Rights of Man, Commonsense*. New York: Everyman's Library.

Pettigrew, T.F. & Martin, J. (1987). Shaping the organizational context for Black American inclusion. *Journal of Social Issues, 43*(1), 41–78.

Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 109 S.Ct. 1775 (1989).

Rogers, J.L. (1988). New paradigm leadership: Integrating the female ethos. *Initiatives, 51*(4), 4–8.

Stephan, W.G. (1985). Intergroup Relations. In Gardner Lindzey & Elliot Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol. 2. Special Fields and Applications* (pp. 599–658). New York: Random House.

Welch, L. (Ed.). (1992). *Perspectives on Minority Women in Higher Education*. New York: Praeger.

Wiley, E., III. (1993, May 6). [Interviews with Paul Robeson, Jr., Cornel West, Manning Marable, & Joyce King]. Intellectual pursuits: Examining the role of Black thinkers in a contemporary world. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, pp. 12–15.

chapter 2

The Contemporary Challenge: Family and Work Issues for Women in Higher Education

Nancy Hensel
University of Maine at Farmington

Abraham Flexnor, in a speech to the National Association of Social Work in 1915 (Glazer & Slater, 1987) called the profession "a brotherhood". He went on to state:

> Professional activities are so definite, so absorbing in interest, so rich in duties and responsibilities, that they completely engage their votaries. The social and personal lives of professional men and their families tend to organize around a professional nucleus. (p. 175)

While Flexnor was addressing a group of social workers, his words could as easily have been applied to higher education in 1915 or in 1996. The women in Flexnor's audience must have wondered whether he intended that the absorbing interests and rich duties and responsibilities of the profession demanded that women either organize their family life around their work or forego marriage and family. In 1915 it was unlikely that families would organize around women's work; in 1996 it is still rare for family life to be focused on the woman's work. Like social work, higher education is rich in duties and responsibilities, a wholly absorptive career (Kanter, 1977). Faculty typically work about 55 hours per week (Russell, 1991; Yoker, 1984); an administrator will work longer. Higher education careers, like Flexnor's social work careers, have been built on the expectation that a spouse is available to manage home and children and to provide support and assistance to the spouse pursuing a career (Hochschild, 1975). While work realities have changed in 1996, expectations of the work place have not significantly changed. Most men now have working wives who are not available to provide support and assistance for the husband's career. Many men have wives who are engaged in their own professional, absorptive careers. How are women, men and children faring when the wife and mother has chosen an administrative career in higher education? How have universities responded and adapted to the needs of a changing work force? The lack of research to answer these difficult and significant questions, suggests that the academy does not yet see work/family issues as important concerns of America's colleges and universities.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Since the 1960s there has been a steady and significant increase in the number of women attending college (Chamberlain, 1988). As a result, women are currently earning more baccalaureate and master's degrees than men and slightly over a third of the doctorate degrees granted in the United States (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1993).

Hiring of women faculty has not kept pace, however, with women's graduation from doctoral programs. In the biological sciences, a traditionally male-dominated field, women actually earned more baccalaureate degrees than men in 1984 (Koshland, 1988). Slightly more men than women earned master's degrees and an equal number of men and women earned doctorate degrees but only a little more than one-third of the new hires in life sciences were women (Vetter and Babco, 1987). If women are not being hired in equal numbers, or even in proportion to the number earning doctorates, at the faculty level, then it is unlikely that women will be equally represented at the administrative level.

A study of 1293 academic deans found that only 13.6 percent were female (Moore, 1983). Bird (1986) found that women administrators marry at a younger age, have fewer children, and are more likely to be part of a two-career family than are male administrators of similar positions, age and educational level. In a later study, Warner and DeFleur (1993) found that 90 percent of the male administrators were married while only 57 percent of the women administrators were married. More telling, perhaps, about the inter-relationship between work and family, was the finding that women were more likely than men to be divorced and that while only three percent of the men in the study had never married, one-third of the women had never married. The study did not investigate reasons for marital status but one must at least consider that Flexnor's thoughts about the family organizing around a professional nucleus may have been part of women's marital decisions. Male administrators are also more likely to have children; nearly 95 percent of the men in the Warner and DeFleur study had children while only 60 percent of the women did. Studies in the corporate world have found that the higher a woman's education, the more likely she is to be employed and the less likely she is to have children (Driscoll & Goldberg, 1993). These statistics suggest that women are finding it difficult to combine family and career and that some may be choosing a career and foregoing have a family. Warner and DeFleur also found that men were more likely than women to have "at home" spouses while women were more likely to have spouses engaged in a professional occupation (Warner & DeFleur, 1993). Men who are interested in having children may prefer "at home" spouses because they know that any significant participation in parenthood can adversely affect their career prospects (Polatnick, 1984).

Men and women administrators have nearly equal educational qualifications with 66 percent of the men and 63 percent of women attaining doctorate degrees (Warner & DeFleur, 1993). Women, however, are more likely to be found in lower level or non-academic administrative positions. Chamberlain (1988) found that, while there has been a steady increase in the number of women administrators since the mid 1970s, women are still under represented in positions of influence such as academic deans, provosts, presidents, and financial or planning officers. In a recent survey of women college presidents (Touchton, Shavlik & Davis, 1993) 178 percent held doctorate degrees and 67 percent came from academic positions such as academic affairs vice presidencies, executive vice presidencies, other academic administrative positions or other presidencies. Women in presidencies tend not to stop-out of their careers; only 14 percent had taken time out from their work for other than professional reasons. Less than 48 percent of non-religious presidents were married; 26 percent were separated, widowed, divorced and another 24 percent had never married. Slightly over half (54 percent) of lay women in presidencies had children. It appears that the path to a presidency is easier if one does not have children. As for women administrators who have children, it appears that most did not take an extended parental leave for childbirth. Driscoll and Goldberg (1993) suggest that the differences between men and women at the top level of the corporate or professional career ladder cannot be minimized. The same appears to be true for higher education.

Most women in administrative careers are not of prime child-bearing age but rather may be at a period in their lives when they are faced with caring for their parents. Only six percent of women presidents are under 40 years of age (Touchton, Shavlik & Davis, 1993) and most academic deans are in the fifty to fifty-nine year age group (Moore, 1983). Women may choose to marry or not marry, have children or not have children but the need to care for elderly parents is not a matter of choice. While parental care is still most likely to fall on daughters rather than sons, it is increasingly an issue that many male faculty and administrators face.

BARRIERS TO WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATION

Moore (1984) found that men and women in the 20 to 29-year-old age cohort are equally represented in the work force. The ratio quickly shifts, however, to favor men. Between the ages of 30 and 39 there are two males for every female, between ages 40 and 49 there are four males for every female and then the ratio equalizes slightly when there are three males to every female worker between 50 and 59 years of age. Moore believes this information suggests three possibilities:

1. mobility among age cohorts will continue to show a preference for youth and most jobs will go to men,
2. women are competing less with women for jobs than with men, and
3. when a woman in the mid-age group receives a high level position, a great deal of attention is focused on her because there are so few women competing for positions in her age range.

Because we know that women are slightly more than half the total population and that women's life expectancies are greater than men's, Moore's data also suggest that more women than men are dropping out of the work force. In higher education this is especially true. Even though the number of women doctorates is increasing, there has been only a slight increase in their labor force participation (Heath and Tuckman, 1989). Several recent reports on the status of women in higher education have indicated that women are not being retained and promoted at the same rate as men (Coordinating Committee on the Status of Women, 1989; Stecklein and Lorenz, 1986; University of Virginia, 1988). Several researchers (Finkel, 1994; Hajnal, 1993; Hensel, 1991; Holt, 1986; Lewis, 1993) have suggested that one reason women drop out of the academic work force is that they find it difficult to respond to the demands for tenure and promotion at the same time as they are attempting to raise a family. When women professors drop out of the academic pipeline, there are fewer women available from which to recruit academic administrators. Holt advises that "most new professional women interested in both career mobility and families find it necessary to employ a reasonable birth control strategy (1986, p. 26). She continues to suggest that "careers and families are not mutually exclusive, but there are only a few incredible career women who can manage large families..." (p. 26). Studies of higher education administrators (Touchton, Shavlik & Davis, 1993; Warner & DeFleur, 1993) suggest that at least half the women who attain top level administrative positions have not done so while balancing family and work responsibilities.

The barriers to women's success in academe are both structural and attitudinal as Holt's advice suggests. Structural barriers include a relative lack of responsiveness of institutions to maternity leave and child care issues, the heavy work demands to achieve tenure that often coincides with child-bearing, and the importance of networking and participation in professional organizations when family responsibilities make it more difficult for women to participate in such activities. Attitudinal barriers are a continuing, though submerged, belief that women should be primarily responsible for the care of home and children and that, if they choose to participate in the work place, they must participate on the terms of the work place rather than expect any accommodations or adjustments. Expectations for retention, promotion or tenure seldom consider the fact that women are working two jobs; one at home and other at the office. Most men do not assume even half of the home responsibilities and so they have not experienced the need to change the work environment to accommodate family concerns (Hochschild, 1989).

Before the Family Leave Act of 1993 few institutions made provisions for maternity leave beyond those mandated by the Pregnancy Disability Act of 1978 (Laughlin & Trout-Baretta, 1990; Hensel, 1990). Employers who provided disability leave and disability insurance coverage were required by the 1978 law to extend such coverage to pregnancy. For many women this meant a six week leave of absence around the time of birth. Most women worked as close to delivery as possible so that they could use their maternity leave to care for their newborn child. Women faculty often try to time their delivery date so it occurs over the summer break, but that is not always possible (Wilson, 1995). It is, of course, very difficult to take a six week leave in the middle of the semester and institutions are often reluctant or unable to provide a substitute instructor during the leave period. If other faculty in the department must cover for the absent new mother, her pregnancy is likely to cause resentment among her colleagues.

Although few women deans have young children (Bird, 1986) it would be difficult for women administrators to take an extended leave should they decide to have a child. There may not be anyone who can fill in for the administrator which means decisions and work may be postponed until the administrator returns. Facing a backlog of work while also caring for a newborn and adjusting to the changes a new child causes in the family, can be overwhelming (Hensel, 1991). A recent case study in the Harvard Business Review (Mock & Bruno, 1994) suggests some of the issues that might confront women in managerial positions who are contemplating beginning a family. In the case study, a woman manager is being considered for promotion but her employer expressed concern that her upcoming pregnancy would interfere with her ability to fulfill his need for her to successfully launch a new product. Even though all four of the case study respondents thought the impending pregnancy should not block a promotion, a woman can never be sure that her own employer will respond based on her qualifications rather than her role as a mother. Faculty women have often been cautioned against having children because they will be perceived as not serious enough about their careers and a pregnancy may interfere with promotion or tenure (Hensel, 1991). Pregnant women administrators are likely to face even more serious questions than women faculty about career commitment.

While women in high level administrative careers are normally beyond the child bearing years, they may have school age children at home who are in need of attention and support. The school age years are filled with children's activities that demand a parent's time. Ballet and music lessons, sports activities as well as simply having friends over to play may compete with professional demands. In addition to caring for children, women in their forties and fifties may also be facing the care of their own parents. The challenges of being part of a family do not subside but rather increase after childbirth and infancy. As children grow older they need continuing emotional support as well as physical care from their parents.

Lack of a supportive environment for combining family and work may be the biggest barrier to women's advancement in academe. The work of a professor or college administrator is never ending and can consume all of one's day. When women feel they must be available for early morning meetings or evening lectures or university events, it makes it very difficult to find time for family and personal responsibilities.

In an effort to reduce the conflict between tenure and child birth, some institutions have implemented a "stop the tenure clock" policy. Such policies normally allow an expectant or new parent to extend the tenure deadline for one year for each birth (Wilson, 1995). While this policy is helpful to new parents, it is mostly women who take advantage of it. Women are likely to take longer to reach tenure and this may have an impact on the timing of and their ability to move into an administrative role. A recent study by the Families and Work Institute (Friendman, Rimsky & Johnson, 1996) has identified other ways in which institutions are responding to work/family conflicts.

Since most deans achieve their positions after successful faculty careers (Moore, 1983), it is critical that women faculty are successful as researchers and writers if they wish to pursue an administrative career. Issues regarding women's scholarly productivity are complex and there are many questions to consider. Some scholars have found that men and women publish at about equal rates (Boice & Kelly, 1987) while other scholars found gender differences in publishing. Hamovitch and Morganstern (1977) for example, found that men publish more than women while Davis and Astin (1987) found that women produced fewer books than men but more chapters in books. Few researchers found a relationships between women's marital or maternal status and their publication record (Cole & Zuckerman, 1987; Hamovitch & Morganstern, 1977). Reskin, however, (1980) found that marriage had a negative impact on women's scholarly productivity while it appeared to stimulate men's scholarly productivity. Widom and Burke (1978) found that marriage was not a factor in women's scholarly productivity but that once they had children their scholarship declined. Although the evidence is inconclusive, it is probably reasonable to conclude that women face additional challenges in maintaining their level of scholarship once they marry and have children.

Tenure and promotion criteria also include teaching with student evaluations of teaching as the most common source of information. Women are at a disadvantage when evaluated by students. Several researchers (Basow & Silberg, 1987; Bennett, 1982; Graham, Davison, Hensel & Mancino, 1992; Martin, 1984) found sex differences in student evaluations. Although women faculty were perceived as having more warmth and personal concern, they received lower ratings on interpersonal contacts with students. Students had higher expectations for personal support from women professors and so they were often rated lower than men on issues of access and nurturance. Students also expected a higher level of preparedness from women faculty than men and were less willing to accept a female professor's expertise. All of these factors place female professors at some disadvantage when compared to male professors. In order for women to receive the same recognition as men for their academic expertise, it is likely that they will need to spend more time in preparing lectures and class activities. Student expectations of women faculty suggest that women professors must also be more available outside of class for advising and consultation than men. This research suggests the likelihood that faculty may have higher expectations of women administrators for warmth, nurturance, and access that further increases the amount of time women administrators spend in the office. Women already spend more time than men (Hochschild, 1989) taking care of children and their home. If the imbalance of home responsibilities carriers over into the work place, women may find themselves in a constant state of conflict over where to cut corners or find extra time. If women professors experience difficulty in being promoted and tenured at the same rate as men, then it also will be more difficult for them to move into administrative positions since most academic administrators come from senior faculty positions.

Attitudinal barriers to women's advancement in the academy stem from long held views that women's work belongs in the private realm and men's work is in the public realm. Eisenstein (1984) argues that the "priorities of a patriarchy, as a system of power, are to keep the choices limited for women so that their role as a mother remains primary" (p. 33). Lewis (1993) suggests that the only way to bring women into the public life is to create a changed, multicultural academy. Clearly, this has not happened. The academy, according to Hochschild (1975) has been designed to reflect the traditional image of the male breadwinner with a traditional wife at home. It has not changed to reflect the fact women who are balancing careers and family have become members, nor the fact that younger male professors are likely to have working wives who are not available to support their careers.

Americans are working more hours than in previous generations and professors work more hours and take more work home than nearly any other profession (Kanter, 1977). Women who become professors are not necessarily able to give up their home responsibilities and so, in effect, they are often working the equivalent of one and a half jobs (Hochschild, 1989). Rather than changing the academy, women have continued the work ethic established by men and are just as likely as women to work long hours and take work home in the evening or on weekends. In addition, women are less likely to reduce their responsibilities at work by changing their personal standards of performance and they are also less likely to use home responsibilities to justify declining additional responsibilities at work (Bird, 1986). Women have tried to fit the male image of an academic career and in some cases have over compensated by assuming more responsibilities. In many work environments it would not be acceptable for a woman to miss a committee meeting because she needs to attend a child's school play, whereas the father wouldn't be expected by the child or mother to go to the play. She would run the risk of being perceived as not sufficiently committed to her career. Men who take responsibility for child care also run the risk of being perceived as not sufficiently committed to the university. Men who allocate a portion of their day time hours to child care may be criticized for not being sufficiently available to students for consultation or to colleagues for meetings. A woman executive interviewed by Driscoll and Goldberg (1993) wondered whether women can sustain the tremendous amount of time and effort required to build a career. "Will their partners, peers or employers give them the luxury of the long view?...How long will we let women take to be 'successful'? Because 'success' for women like me includes a balanced life (p. 66)." Many men are also seeking a balanced life. The age of William H. Whyte's "organizational man" is quickly disappearing as professional men and women seek employers who recognize the family and personal aspects of their employees' lives (Driscoll & Goldberg, 1993; Kimmel, 1993).

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN

Research about the effects of maternal employment on children has followed several trends in the last forty years. In the 1950s, when women were encouraged to remain home with their children, two types of research were used to support this social movement. Orphanage studies done during World War II found that infants in residence did not form attachment relationships with their caregivers and, as a result, suffered physical and emotional problems. Other researchers focused on older children who returned to empty homes after school. These children had inadequate supervision and as a consequence were frequently in trouble. Emotional instability or juvenile delinquency were identified as consequences of mothers' employment outside the home. During the late sixties and early seventies the women's movement encouraged women to seek paid employment outside the home. As more and more women entered the work force, the need for day care increased and a new trend in research developed. Research in the 1970s focused on the effect on the child of having a working mother and of participation in day care. The results of such research have been inconclusive. Day care studies have found both positive and negative effects. When day care infants are compared with stay-at-home infants, mixed results of attachment behavior have been observed (Clarke-Stewart, 1989). In some cases day care infants exhibit strong attachments to their mothers. In other cases, day care infants exhibit less attachment when stranger anxiety is used as a measure. It is possible, however, that day care infants exhibit less stranger anxiety because they are used to being around strangers. Day care infants do form attachments with other adults and such attachments might have a positive impact on the child's later social development. Day care infants have also been observed to be more aggressive than non-day care infants. Some researchers have suggested that these early signs of aggression may be the beginnings of independence and that children of working mothers are encouraged by their mothers as well as their day care teachers to be more independent than children whose mothers do not work (Clarke-Stewart, 1989). Working mothers probably place more value on independence because it makes their daily lives easier while non-working mothers may want to prolong the child's dependence because it validates their role as a caregiver. The difficulty with day care research is that the timing of when the child is placed in day care, the quality of the day care environment, and the caregiving styles of parent and day care teacher must be controlled if the impact of day care is to be isolated from other factors.

Other researchers looked at effects of maternal employment on older children. Hoffman and Nye (1974) found that the impact on children of an employed mother varied depending on age and sex of the child and the mother's feelings about her work. When the mother wanted to work and enjoyed her job, the effects tended to be more positive. Little research has been done to study the impact on the child of having two working parents, particularly when both parents are involved in demanding professional careers.

In a series of interviews with children of highly accomplished parents, Brooks (1989) asks why some children who appear to have all of the necessary conditions for success, find it elusive. She suggests that some parents may have difficulty accepting the idea that their children may not share their parents' capabilities, drive or interests. When parents do not recognize the child's true capabilities and interests, their responses to the child may be inappropriate. Brooks further suggests that successful parents may believe that their own success will automatically pave the way for their child's success. When children of highly successful parents do achieve, Brooks believes it is because the parents have carefully nurtured the child's self-esteem throughout childhood. Such nurturing takes time and time is of a premium with parents actively engaged in professional careers. Studies of time spent with children have indicated that working mothers may spend more time interacting individually with their children as a way of compensating for not being available throughout the day. The amount of time fathers spend with their children is limited although there are indications that fathers are increasingly placing more importance on their relationships with their children (Shellenbarger, 1994). Corporations, for example, have reported that fathers are less willing to uproot the family for a promotion because of the impact the move might have on their children's lives as well as their wives' careers.

The significant increase in maternal employment began over twenty years ago. Many of these children are now grown up and either in college or beginning their own careers. A comparison of the young adult children of career and non-career mothers would be useful in determining the long term impact of maternal employment. To my knowledge such studies are not available. A recent article in Working Woman (Kruger, 1994), however, talks about the desire of "baby busters" to place family ahead of career advancement. The young women interviewed indicted that they intended to work part-time or as independent consultants while their children were young. Many talked about the struggles their mothers had made in balancing a career and family and they did not want to emulate their mothers' lives.

The challenges of juggling a career and family have been well documented (Crosby, 1991). Based on an extensive literature review as well as interviews with fifty working mothers, Crosby concludes that juggling a career and family responsibilities is actually healthy for women and their children. Crosby does acknowledge the level of stress many women feel about their multiple roles but she suggests that the stress does not outweigh the real pleasure women obtain from working and raising children. Baruch, Barnett and Rivers (1983) had reached a similar conclusion a few years earlier when they found that married, employed mothers were the women highest in well-being of the groups in their sample. Researchers have not asked parents, however, how they felt about the decisions they made about career and family. As parents look back over the choices they made in balancing career and family responsibilities, do they feel satisfied? Do they feel they spent the time they wanted with their children? Do they feel they devoted enough time to their career? While most parents have some regrets about time not spent with children, do working parents differ from non-working parents on this issue? What kinds of support from their employers would have made their job of juggling a career and family easier? And finally, how do the children feel about their parents' choices? As young adults they can reflect back on their childhood. Do they feel that their parents were available when they needed them? Do they feel they spent too much time alone or that their parents were not interested in their activities? Do they view their mothers and fathers as positive role models because of the way they balanced career and family? With the maturing of a new generation which has experienced new ways of parenting, it is time that such retrospective studies are done in order to fully answer the question of the impact of dual career parents.

CHANGING ACADEME

Universities can take several steps to change the policies and structures of the academy but these steps will be meaningless unless the norms and values of the institution also change. Since universities are preparing future leaders and managers it is imperative that higher education become a leading force in creating family-responsive places of employment and helping employees balance family and career. Deans, as administrators, must set a model for establishing an appropriate balance between commitment to one's career and having a personal life outside of the institution. While family leave is mandated by federal law, mandates are not enough to ensure that employees take advantage of existing leave policies. Deans must educate all employees about the law and establish a climate where it is acceptable to use family leave when appropriate. Sometimes we must take a look at our own attitudes, too. A few years ago a woman faculty approached me about her maternity leave. She requested two weeks before the birth of her baby and a substitute instructor for the remainder of the semester. My first thought was that her demands were excessive. After all, I thought, I returned to work only two weeks after the birth of my child. Fortunately, I did not verbalize these thoughts because I quickly realized that I had not had an opportunity to take a longer leave. In 1973, when my child was born, there was no job security protection after a maternity leave and, in fact, I was only the second woman faculty in my college to give birth while in a tenure track position. We have to refrain from an attitude of "I did it, why can't you" and look at what is best for the faculty member as well as the child.

Institutions must begin to examine their expectations of all employees. American workers have been increasing the amount of time they devote to work and in some cases it has been to the detriment of their health or family life. The Wall Street Journal (Stevens, 1994) reported on a lawsuit filed by the father of a suicide victim. The suit contended that the excessive work hours expected of a junior law associate led to overwork and eventually suicide. The suit was unsuccessful but the law profession has begun discussing the number of billable hours expected of young lawyers. The medical profession has been undergoing a similar self-examination after a patient died, ostensibly because the young intern had been overworked and undersupervised. The British Medical Association is investigating reports that an intern died after spending 86 hours on the job. In the United States overwork is not recognized in case law, but in Japan litigants have been successful in establishing overwork as a cause of death. While academic jobs are not generally as demanding in terms of hours as those of medical interns and new law associates, many young faculty may spend 40 hours at the university and another 20 to 40 hours working at home grading papers, preparing for classes and working on their research and writing. The work normally expected of faculty and administrators should be within the range of a normal 40 hour work week. Unfortunately, this is seldom the case. It is not uncommon on many campuses to see the lights on in the president's or deans' offices well after the rest of the university has gone home. Top level administrators must set limits on their work so that they can be positive models for all employees. Unfortunately, it is often junior employees who are pressing for changes while senior administrators continue to maintain the status quo. A woman junior lawyer introduced a paid sabbatical policy to her law firm. The senior partners were skeptical about the benefits of sabbatical leave but they approved her proposal. When she had been employed the requisite amount of time, she applied for and was granted a sabbatical. Upon return she filed a report on how she handled her clients and the benefits of her sabbatical activities. In the six years the policy was in effect she was the only employee to take advantage of it (Driscoll & Goldberg, 1993). The senior partners could have been positive role models for seeking balance and renewal in their lives had they been the first to make use of the sabbatical policy.

While teaching and research are the primary faculty responsibilities, there are other demands which must be kept within reasonable limits as well. In many colleges and universities, faculty and administrators attend functions in the evening for student, alumni and community activities. While these are important to the life of the university, expected participation must be placed within the context of the employee's life outside the university.

Businesses have become increasingly involved in thinking about their employees' lives outside of work. The provision of retirement, life insurance and health benefits are the most common examples of employer concern about their employees' well-being. Many corporations and institutions also have programs to assist with substance abuse problems, to provide advice on child care programs, and to provide seminars on parenting and self-improvement concerns. Recently some corporations and universities have become concerned about the physical fitness of their employees and have offered fitness club memberships or on-site exercise programs to improve the well-being of their employees. Managers recognize that the health and well-being of their employees contributes to productivity and business success.

A new management strategy is to create a sense of community, a family-like atmosphere, in the work place. This trend has coincided with an increase in the number of dual-career couples and an increase in the number of hours professionals spend at work. Is the attempt to develop a sense of community in the work environments because a family-like atmosphere is more conducive to productivity or because workers are replacing time with their families for time at work? Hochschild (1997) suggests that as families experience more stress in balancing home and work responsibilities, they may be finding more personal satisfaction at work than at home. Observers of universities have described a decline in the sense of community on campuses and attributed it to the increase in the number of dual career families. Academic couples often cannot find jobs in the same town and so one may face a lengthy commute or they may choose to live in between both of their jobs. Such living arrangements decrease the likelihood of socializing with colleagues outside of work. Older colleagues have described faculty pot luck or progressive dinners which used to be a regular part of their social lives. But today no one has time to clean the house and prepare a meal for company and so the informal sense of community has declined. Institutions and businesses are replacing the informal socialization with more formal efforts to recreate a sense of community. The question arises, however, that if we had more realistic demands on employees perhaps they would create their own social lives and the sense of community would not be so important at the work place.

Kofodimos (1993), a management consultant, suggests that if we value individual and organizational effectiveness, we must create a supportive organization which recognizes the importance of balance between demands of the organization and the need for a personal life outside the organization. She suggests that we must address the fundamental sources of imbalance in an organization through three levels of organizational change. First, the expectations of the organization's role in the leaders' networks of time, energy and commitment must be examined. Second, the nature of what is valued within the organization in terms of leadership behaviors around mastery (focusing on rationality, taking charge, conveying a demeanor of self-confidence) or intimacy (focusing on people's feelings and needs, collaborating, and displaying a playful attitude at work) must be examined. And third, the organization's assumptions about organizational development and human development must be examined. Kofodimos suggests that if we value an effective organization we must be concerned about a balanced organization as well as balanced lives of employees. A balanced organization is one which is adaptable and is likely to survive in the midst of our current economic and social challenges. When organizations examine the sources of imbalance, she suggests they will help leaders and other employees to set boundaries on their work load so that they can develop satisfying personal lives as well as successful professional lives. Organizations should strive to create an environment which supports both mastery- and intimacy-oriented behaviors through looking at individual talents and aspirations and encouraging the potential of each employee rather than fitting them into corporate slots. And finally, she suggests that organizations create a climate that supports self-realization by empowering employees to make decisions about their work activities, performance appraisals, and career path.

Deans and university administrators can take several specific steps to encourage balance between work effectiveness and personal satisfaction in their employees:

1. Conduct a family responsiveness audit of university policies and practices to determine the level of support for employees who are in a caregiving role and to eliminate factors which add to work family conflict.
2. Develop policies which genuinely support caregiving and enable employees to respond to family situations when needed.
3. Set boundaries on one's work life to establish a climate of acceptability for balance between work and personal interests.
4. Establish performance standards for all employees which recognize the roles of employees outside, as well as inside, the organization.

BENEFITS TO THE UNIVERSITY

Americans are facing many social crises in their everyday lives. Some have advocated that women in leadership roles will operate with more integrity and create more caring work environments than men have done in the past. Women are beginning to change the work environment as they become more established members of the work force. The issue, however, is not an issue of female versus male work styles. The issue is how do we, as men and women, adapt to the changes in our social structures? The United States is third in the world in terms of its dependence on women workers (Driscoll & Goldberg, 1993). More women than men have entered the work force in recent years. Clearly, the personnel practices of America's corporations and institutions must change to recognize the different and changing needs of men and women employees.

Crosby (1991) and Baruch, Barnett and Rivers (1983) have pointed out that women are happier when their realm of achievements is not limited to one sphere. Kimmel (1993) has suggested that men are also seeking balance in their lives between work and family. If we change our organizations so they support the juggling women currently do to manage their families, we will make their lives less stressful. Such changes will make it easier for men to become active participants in raising their children and to share home responsibilities with their wives. Families as well as businesses or institutions will benefit.

The educational community must become a leader in forging changes in the work place. As administrators and faculty we serve as models for young people who will become the leaders of tomorrow. We must be in the forefront of advocating for social change and establishing caring work places. Thoughtful solutions to work/family conflict must be sought with deliberation rather than allowing these concerns to simply work themselves out over time. Children need nurturing and loving parents; a primary focus of every society is the creation of a happy and healthy next generation. Parents who have inadequate time to spend with their children cannot provide the optimal level of nurturance. In addition, when parents are conflicted between work and home responsibilities, their creative energies are not at their optimal level and the research mission of higher education may be compromised. The educational community must put its creative and intellectual energies into establishing employment practices which support a balance between work and family responsibilities. Such an effort will benefit every aspect of society.

REFERENCES

Baruch, G., Barnett, R. & Rivers, C. (1983). *Life Prints: New Patterns of Love and Work for Today's Woman.* New York: New American Library.

Basow, S.A. & Silberg, N.T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(1), 308–314.

Bennett, S.K. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to questions of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 170–179.

Bird, G. (1986). Family and career characteristics of women and men college and university administrators. In *Strategies and Attitudes: Women in Educational Administration*, P. Farrant (ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors.

Boice, R. & Kelly, K. (1987). Writing viewed by disenfranchised groups: A study of women and women's college faculty. *Written Communications*, 4(3), 299–309.

Brooks, A.A. (1989). *Children of Fast-Track Parents: Raising Self-sufficient and Confident Children in an Achievement-Oriented World.* New York: Viking.

Chamberlain, M.K. (ed.). (1988). *Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1993). *Almanac Issue.* August 25. Washington, D.C.: The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Clarke-Stewart, A. (February, 1989). Infant day care: Maligned or malignant? *American Psychologist*, 44(2), 266–273.

Cole, J.R. & Zuckerman, H. (February, 1987). Marriage, motherhood, and research performance in science. *Scientific American*, 256, 119–125.

Coordinating Committee on the Status of Women. (March, 1989). *Report of the C.C.S.W.* Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.

Crosby, F.J. (1991). *Juggling: The Unexpected Advantages of Balancing Career and Home for Women and Their Families.* New York: The Free Press.

Davis, D. & Astin, H. (1987). Reputational standing in academe. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58(3), 261–275.

Driscoll, D.M. & Goldberg, C.R. (1993). *Members of the Club: The Coming of Age of Executive Women*. New York: The Free Press.

Eisenstein, Z.R. (1984). *Feminism and Sexual Equality: Crisis in Liberal America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Finkel, S.K. (1994). Personal letter and unpublished dissertation abstract, "The effects of bearing and raising children on the careers of female assistant professors." November 10, 1993.

Friedman, D.E., Rimsky, C. & Johnson, A.A. (1996). *College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs*. New York: CUPA Foundation and Families and Work Institute.

Glazer, A., Davison, K., Hensel, N. & Mancino, A. (1992). Gender differences in student evaluations of part-time faculty. *Proceedings of the 5th Annual International Conference for Women in Higher Education*. El Paso: The University of Texas at El Paso.

Hajnal, V.J. (1993). Gender differences in the number of educator's offspring: Who should care? *Gender Issues in the Classroom and on the Campus: Focus on the 21st Century Vision, Voice, Victory*. Minneapolis: AAUW Pre-Convention Workshop.

Hamovitch, W. & Morganstern, R.D. (1977). Children and the productivity of academic women. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48(6), 633–645.

Heath, J.A. & Tuckman, H. (1989). The impact of labor markets on the relative growth of new female doctorates. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(6), 704–715.

Hensel, N. (1990). Maternity, promotion and tenure: Are they compatible? In *Issues for Women in Higher Education*, L. Welsh (ed.). New York: Praeger.

Hensel, N. (1991). *Realizing Gender Equality in Higher Education: The Need to Integrate Work/Family Issues*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 2. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Hochschild, A. (1975). Inside the clockwork of male careers. In *Women and the Power to Change*, F. Howe (ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home*. New York: Viking.

Hochschild, A. (1997). *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home & Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company.

Hoffman, L. & Nye, F.I. (eds.). (1974). *Working Mothers: An Evaluative Review of the Consequences for Wife, Husband, and Child*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holt, M.E. (1986). Strategies for the "ascent of woman" in higher education administration in the 80s. In *Strategies and Attitudes: Women in Educational Administration*, P. Farrant (ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors.

Kanter, R.B. (1977). *Work and Family in the United States: A Critical Review and Agenda for Research Policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kimmel, M. (1993). What do men want? *Harvard Business Review*, November–December, 50–63.

Kofodimos, J. (1993). *Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate Successful Careers and Fulfilling Personal Lives.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Koshland, D.E. (1988). Women in science. *Science*, 239 (4847), 1473.

Kruger, P. (1994, May). Superwoman's Daughters. *Working Woman*, 60–62.

Laughlin, P. & Trout-Baretta, M.J. *An Analysis of Maternity, Sick and Family Leave Policies of Sixteen Major Research Universities.* Paper presented at International Conference on Women in Higher Education, El Paso, Texas.

Lewis, J.L. (1993). *Gender and Diversity in the Academy: Dissolving the Glass Ceiling.* Paper presented at the AAUW Pre-Convention Workshop, Minneapolis.

Martin, M. (1984). Power and authority in the classroom: Sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 9(3), 182–192.

Mock, C. & Bruno, A. (1994, Jan.–Feb.). The expectant executive and the endangered promotion. *Harvard Business Review.*

Moore, K. (1984). Careers in college and university administration: How are women affected? In *Women in Higher Education Administration*, A. Tinsley, C. Secor, and S. Kaplan (eds.). New Directions for Higher Education (45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, K. (1983). *Leaders in Transition: A National Study of Higher Education Administrators, The Top Line: A Report on Presidents', Provosts' and Deans' Careers.* Center for the Study of Higher Education Report No. 83–711, State College, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Polatnick, M.R. (1984). Why men don't rear children: A power analysis. In *Mothering: Essays in Feminist Theory*, J. Trebilcot (ed.). Totawa, N.J.: Rocoman & Allanheld Publishers.

Reskin, B.F. (1980). *Sex Differences in the Professional Life Changes of Chemists.* New York: Arno Press.

Russell, S.H., Fairweather, J.S., & Zimbler, L.J. (1991). *Profiles of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education, Office of Research and Improvement.

Sheilenbarger, S. (1994, March 16). Work and family. *The Wall Street Journal*, B1.

Stecklein, J.E. & Lorenz, G.E. (1986). Academic women: Twenty-four years of progress? *Liberal Education*, 72(1), 63–71.

Stevens, A. (1994, April 15). Suit over suicide raises issue: Do associates work too hard? *The Wall Street Journal*, B1.

Touchton, J., Shavlik, D. & Davis, L. (1993). *Women in Presidencies: A Descriptive Study of Women College and University Presidents.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

University of Virginia. (1988). *Toward Equity: The Final Report of the Task Force on the Status of Women.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia.

Vetter, B.M. & Babco, E.L. (1987). *Professional Women and Minorities: A Manpower Data Resource Service.* Washington, D.C.: Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology.

Warner, R. & DeFleur, L.B. (1993). Career paths of women in higher education administration. In *Cracking the Wall: Women in Higher Education Administration*, P. Mitchell (ed.). Washington, D.C.: The College and University Personnel Association.

Widom, C.S. & Burke, B.W. (1978). Performance, attitudes and professional socialization of women in academia. *Sex Roles*, 4(4), 549–562.

Wilson, R. (1995, March 10). Scheduling motherhood. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A14.

Yuker, H.E. (1984). *Faculty Workload: Research, Theory and Interpretation*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University. ED 259 961. 120 pp. MF-01; PC-05.

chapter 3

Recharting the Paths of Women and Minority Leaders: A Journey of Consequence

Jane Stallings
Texas A&M University

It was not in my life plan to become a dean. I have known myself as a teacher, researcher, author and mother. My plan in 1990 was to step down as a department head at the University of Houston and write, paint, and come to know myself as a grandmother.

When the call came from the chair of the College of Education Dean's Search Committee at Texas A&M inquiring about my interest in applying for the position, my response was one of incredulity. First, I knew little of Texas A&M's reputation in education. Second, I was relatively a newcomer to higher education with no experience in the dean's office. My professional stripes had been earned in conducting contract research in schools and translating research findings to usable knowledge for teachers and principals. At the urging of the quite-persuasive search committee chair, we arranged a preliminary meeting with few members of the committee.

The meeting occurred in Houston since my schedule was limited and my map didn't include College Station. At that meeting, the chair asked me to describe my vision for a reformed education system. No one had ever seriously asked me that question. As my answer unfolded, members of the group said, we can help you accomplish those things. I was later to find this was no idle gesture. It was solidly backed by the search committee chair who had institutional clout in his dual role as vice chancellor for engineering of the Texas A&M University System and as the dean of the College of Engineering. When I finally decided to take a detour from my life plan and accept the position, it was with the condition that he would be my mentor. To his credit and my good fortune, he kept his word.

During my initial meeting with the president and the provost, they made their expectation for the College of Education very clear. The charge given to me included:

1. Increase external funding through contracts, grants and endowments;
2. increase the number of minority students and faculty;
3. increase the quality of the doctoral programs and the tenure and promotion process;
4. bring national visibility for the College of Education and become nationally ranked;
5. increase female and minority leadership.

I accepted this challenge estimating it would require four to five years to accomplish these tasks. The Texas Coordinating Board was threatening to withhold accreditation from two doctoral programs. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) site visit was due the following spring. These were formidable feats for the faculty and a new College of Education administration.

In regard to female and minority leadership, consider that for much of its 117 years of service to Texas, Texas A&M was an all-male military school strongly oriented to agricultural and engineering curricula. Only since the late 1960s have women been admitted and participation in the Corps of Cadets been made optional. In the 1980s the hiring of women and minorities became a priority at Texas A&M. I was the university's first female dean. There were no female or minority associate deans in the history of the College of Education. Though an African-American has recently been appointed as interim dean of the college of Liberal Arts, no minorities had previously held permanent appointments at this level of university administration. Out of a university total of 2500 tenure track faculty, only 194 are female. Of these, only 26 hold the rank of full professor. Nine are in our college. Ethnic minority faculty total 184 and 54 at the rank of full professor. In 1990, there was one minority full professor in our college and he left for a better position in December 1990.

In examining this situation, I have concluded there has been no conspiracy to keep minorities and women from being hired or placed in leadership positions, but rather a tendency for selection committee members to choose individuals similar to themselves. Given that the college and university leadership is predominantly Anglo and male, it is not surprising that committee composition reflected this leadership. For example, in our college a female nationally recognized full professor had never been appointed to a search committee during her 15 years prior to my coming to Texas A&M University.

Without guidelines specifying otherwise, it is natural for selection committees to choose new colleagues with whom they feel comfortable. It is unnatural to select those different from yourself. Believing that we all can profit from a little dis-equilibrium, a system for creating equity in committees was installed. College and department committees were required to include women, ethnic minorities, and representation from more than one department. The result was dramatic. Of the 23 faculty hired during my first three years, eight were minority and 11 were women. This success can be attributed to a policy of actively pursuing qualified candidates who had promise of bringing diverse perspectives on educational issues. Such diversity is essential to the development of professional educators serving the citizens of Texas. Rather than waiting for applications, search committees activate all of the college's and university's informal networks to locate potential candidates. Two of the new stars were hired all but dissertation (ABD) before they entered the job market. This strategy was useful since we had too often been outbid in our pursuit for minority candidates by other universities with superior resources and in urban locations.

Another great concern for me was the loss of three minority faculty during my first semester as dean. Their decisions had been made before I arrived. To understand their concerns, a meeting of minority faculty was called. This was the first time they had ever gathered as a group. There were five African-American and four Hispanic professors, none of them tenured. As I listened to their concerns, it became clear that they were overused by the administration in an effort to provide minority representation on many university committees. They carried extraordinary student advisory loads. One assistant professor who was being considered for tenure had 300 advisees plus a four course teaching load. During the discussion the faculty described the focus of their research studies and what they needed to do their best scholarly work. For some this included course reductions, for others it meant an assistant or a computer. Through a concerted effort across the departments the conditions necessary for these faculty to achieve as scholars were met. During the next two years, three minority faculty were tenured and promoted to the associate professor rank. Happily, during the first three years of my deanship we did not lose any minority faculty and we were able to hire five new minority faculty during that time period. Since the population of Texas is so diverse, it is imperative that our faculty provide a wide variety of perspectives on educational issues across the entire curriculum.

Given my previous experience with contracts and grants, I felt more confident with the president's expectation to increase external funding. We set a goal of 5 million a year by 1994. To achieve this we held a meeting for faculty interested in writing research grants. To our surprise, 50 people appeared. Their response to our questions of what they needed to get started included technical assistance in writing proposals and budgets, brush up on statistics and design, updated technology and graduate research assistants. To meet their needs, we delegated one associate dean as the dean of research. His task was to provide the information and assistance faculty needed to locate, write and win grants. Within 3 years, we met the five million dollar per year goal.

On a day-to-day basis, mostly I noticed the isolation, a situation which is most likely a common experience in positions of leadership. There were many intervening forces which contributed to the difficulty in developing sustaining friendships from the dean's office. This may be more difficult for women in those positions because of an unstated sexual social barrier which doesn't allow even professional relationships between men and women peers to go unnoticed. In addition, faculty seem to hold the deanship in some mixture of awe, fear, disdain, and respect all contributing to the distance in relationships. My egalitarian style had not prepared me for this authoritarian structure. Always before in my work life, my working associates have also been my best friends including my staff. We worked and played together and raised each others children and we still communicate. *The academic caste system by rank and role is foreign to my philosophy and experience.*

Coming to know all of the faculty and building personal relationships was a priority for me. But, given the communication gaps, this was not easy...the system was often swept by the ill winds of rumor announcing some decision by the dean certain to make life a bit more difficult in the future. Some circumstances contributed to these feelings. For example, prior to my arrival there had been an interim dean for 18 months. Quite naturally many difficult organizational and personnel decisions were long overdue. While faculty participated in generating possible solutions, I made it clear that two troubled small departments could not stay they were. Three assistant professors had been denied tenure. Exiting interviews with me revealed a lack of mentoring and a third year review. Within nine months of my arrival, a new department was formed from the two old ones with a new dynamic department head hired through a national search. Some of the decisions made regarding restructuring departments were not popular in the short run, but have served the college well in the long run. For the most part, faculty morale and productivity increased while costs to the colleges were significantly reduced. My reputation as being decisive and a bit of a dragon lady was earned during that time. What happened and what faculty perceived to have happened may never be unraveled.

I came to understand that the channels which flow between the dean's office, department heads, and faculty are subject to twists, turns, and misinterpretations. Clearly, more direct communication was needed between the faculty and myself. To combat rumors and establish trust levels some new avenues of communication were opened.

During my first months on the job, I was surprised to hear from many faculty that they had never visited the dean's office on the eighth floor of Harrington Tower. The dean's office was a mysterious vacuum. To get acquainted informally, we took advantage of their curiosity, and initiated Wednesday afternoon Ivory Tower Power Hour. From 3:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m., faculty and graduate students were invited to squeeze into my office and deliberate on educational issues such as equity, the moral ethical dimensions of education, responsibility in responding to complex societal needs, and threats to higher education as we know it. The only house rules were that rank and degrees were dropped at the door. All voices were equal and ideas were the coin of the realm. Out of these gatherings came a monthly For Your Information (FYI) newsletter with columns reporting faculty activity and a one-page forum for faculty issues.

Another effort to develop relationships with faculty was to meet with the Faculty Advisory Council. This was viewed as a powerless committee upon which few faculty chose to serve. After a rather rocky start....I thought the Faculty Advisory Council meant they were to be my advisory committee to discuss problems before they became problems. Imagine my surprise when meetings were often scheduled at times when I could not attend. They didn't expect me to attend. Meetings often focused on problems and fault rather than on solving problems. Representatives did not experience their roles as advocates for faculty concerns. When I first asked them to poll their departments for faculty issues, one longtime member asked incredulously, "You mean you want us to ask faculty about how they might like things to change?" The effect of the long military tradition of top down organizational rule was pervasive. Faculty could not believe that I wanted them to participate in the governance of the college. As a symbol of my respect and need for Faculty Advisory Council ideas, their chair was invited to be a member of the monthly Dean's Council. By the summer of 1993 when we embarked on the Total Quality Management (TQM) process to guide the restructuring of college programs, they did believe that participation in governance was their right and responsibility. At that point I found myself with a tiger by the tail with unleashed pent-up energy. Although dangerous I have always preferred tigers to pussy cats.

To make my lifestyle a little more conducive to building friendships, I purchased a house suitable for entertaining faculty, students and friends. The first house warming party hosted faculty with young children. They filled the pool with laughter and splashes. The second party included new faculty and their spouses or significant other. The importance of these small gatherings to building relationships across the college could not be over estimated.

As in most institutions of higher education, professional women, serious about developing their careers, find themselves separated from their spouses whose professions keep them in another city. For all of its appeal, College Station is not the mecca of job opportunities. My husband spent most of his time on the NASA site two and one-half hours south of College Station. Other husbands had their residences in Austin, Detroit, and Washington, DC. This situation prompted the week-day widows to form a town and gown social club for laughter and support when the system became incomprehensible. Many prehistoric problems were solved to our satisfaction between sips of champagne luxuriating in my hot tub.

The group was multidimensional and included the director of international programs, the director of personnel, a special assistant to the president, two College of Education professors, a graduate student, a real estate agent and myself. Mostly, we met at my home to read and discuss *Women Who Run With The Wolves* (Estes 1992). One evening we had a Jungian psychologist to help interpret the metaphors. Sometimes we had large gag gift seasonal parties hosted by the ladies of the club. To our surprise this spontaneous group aroused jealously or fear in some anonymous person who wrote a scathing letter to the president (carbon copied to other senior administrators) asking how he could permit this exclusive women's administrators group to exist. Was he likely to permit such an exclusive men's group? With a copy in my hand, I visited the president. He smiled and said it was not university business. The group met in my home. It was clearly not exclusive or bent on doing damage to anyone. Incidentally, his wife sometimes attended because she often met the qualifications for a week-day widow. More than any other time in my life, I came to value the enduring strengths and creative versatility of women.

My concerns for our college of education transcend my minority status as a female dean to the status of our college among the other colleges in the university. While there was a well-stated commitment to education from the university leadership, the financial resources did not match the verbalization. Since 1990 there has been a discouraging trend for the salaries of the College of Education faculty to slip behind those of all other colleges. For some time we were keeping pace with liberal arts and architecture, but that did not continue. How this slippage occurred was a mystery since the years in question allowed only strict 3% across the board raises. Clearly, there were unmarked financial avenues I needed to discover. Other deans, with programs more understandable in a university focused on the sciences, developed strategies to compete for scarce unmarked resources. Clearly, the College of Education faculty was appraising my ability to bring home the bacon. Budget hearings prompted a call for advice to my mentor.

Fortunately, a uniquely qualified and complementary team of men and women were lured from the faculty to become associate deans and partners in restructuring the financial planning. We shared a win/win philosophical bond and built on each others special strengths. Because they had a long history with this academic institution, their collective experience helped guide me to problem solutions which bypassed positions that are at odds with the general culture of the university. Overall we worked long hours and laughed a lot.

The social climate of the college and the university changed. The discomfort level, mentioned previously, of working with those different from yourself was apparent among some of the university and system leadership. When I first arrived they tried to change their manner of addressing a group that now included a woman dean. Typically, the greetings of the all male regents opened the meetings with male terminology adding hastily "and you, too, Dean Stallings." They were very respectful, even courtly, but they were not accustomed to the presence of a woman dean. Especially important was the election of Ann Richards as governor. Within two years she appointed three women and two minorities to the historically male board of regents.

There was much to learn in those growing years for all of us. Seeking diversity among faculty and student was more than a slogan now, it was an action item with proper recognition for results.

This section was written in early spring 1993 and reflects my first 3 years as Dean of the College of Education. The Appendix chronicles the time from 1994 to 1995 when I stepped down as dean.

REFERENCES

Estes, C.P. (1992). *Women Who Run with the Wolves*, 1st ed. New York: Ballantine Books.

APPENDIX

Post Script—Autumn, 1995

Beyond any of my goals or expectations, in Spring 1994, I became president of the American Educational Research Association. Only after the urging of several senior faculty and checking with the Dean's Council, Faculty Advisory Committee and the senate representatives, did I agree, in fall 1992, to run for that office. We all understood that if I won, it would mean being gone from the campus for a great deal of time. This was a serious consideration since I was also serving on the national boards of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Holmes and the National Science Foundation's Engineering Division. Against all odds, I won, signaling a beginning and an ending.

At the same time, in fall 1992, our central administration started having significant upheavals. The chair of the search committee who had persuaded me to apply for the deanship at Texas A&M had become the Chancellor of the System. Within a year, the regents were dissatisfied with him and he was replaced by the president who had hired me. The Provost who hired me became the interim president. In Summer 1994, a new president from Oklahoma was hired. The interim president (previous provost) went back to faculty, leaving that office to become a free-for-all contest among the associate provosts. Concurrently, the regents became disenchanted with the chancellor. They disagreed on some very basic issues. He resigned in protest and went back to faculty. The fourth chancellor in five years was appointed. This instability among the administrators of the university and the system was very disheartening and disorienting to the faculty and deans of the colleges. Raises had been denied for two consecutive years and storms were brewing among the faculty, particularly in the College of Education where we had historically received the lowest pay.

During my year of AERA presidency, those faculty who were disenchanted with my perceived emphasis upon teacher education, comprehensive field-based programs, grantsmanship and scholarship mounted a very serious effort to topple my administration. This started in the summer of 1994. Because several associate provosts were competing for the position of provost, they gave ear to the many faculty complaints and did not keep me informed of their discontent. No one said, "Let's talk this over with Jane." Although the interim provost felt kindly toward me and supportive of my accomplishments, he was daunted by the viciousness of the attacks. They listened to the accusations and the case against me was carefully built.

Some faculty were particularly angry at my intention to shift to a student-credit-hour driven budget. This consideration stemmed from the fact that our undergraduate studentbody was increasing significantly while the graduate studentbody was decreasing. More institutional dollars would have solved the problem, but regardless of my pleas and rationale to the provost, the budget for the college remained flat. By edict of the regent, we were not allowed to cap the undergraduate enrollment: Too many children and grandchildren of Aggies wanted a coveted enrollment slot at TAMU. Our teacher education program has become popular with students and parents since our graduates are sought after in this teacher hungry state. Field-basing all of our teacher education courses in professional development schools has won us two national awards and client satisfaction, but field-basing is costly. For example, field-based methods courses can not be taught in classes of 300. For some classes, 30 or more new sections were required to meet student graduation needs. Thinking that faculty would respond to this reality, I naively announced that state resources would have to follow students and more faculty would need to teach undergraduates and supervise student teachers. Faculty in two departments responded heroically; some added an undergraduate course others supervised student teachers. Still, more funds for lectures were needed to cover required courses. This meant shifting funds.

Two departments served graduate students only and were composed primarily of senior professors who established the college. A third department had only a few special education students with their primary focus on graduate programs. The senior professors in these departments were deeply committed to the programs and courses they had developed. They attracted excellent students from across the nation. In all cases the graduate programs across the college have enjoyed small class loads and privileged budgets to which they have become accustomed. The fact that the graduate student enrollment had diminished and that small classes of two or three could not be permitted, did not convince them that shifts in the budget were required to achieve some balance and equity for the college of education students. Too few senior people joined in the effort to secure research grants to attract and support graduate students. They clung to the images of the 1980s when the oil dollars flowed freely and the previous dean could respond positively to their requests for resources and the full support of graduate students. They were not accustomed to assisting in the support of themselves and students through grants and contracts. Some felt insulted that I asked them to participate, they reserved their right to be supported as scholars. They could not grasp that by 1992, we were no longer a state supported but rather a state-assisted institution. Sixty percent of our college budget came from external funds. These issues of budget allocation were probably the primary source of anger directed at me by the senior faculty. The heads in two of the departments fed the discontent. It was, after all, their budgets which were being threatened.

It was after my return from an AERA and Office of Educational Research and Improvement sponsored conference in early October, 1994, that I became aware of the tangled web that was being woven from strands of budget fabrication, rumors, and fear of loss. I thought more information would clear the air and end the palace revolt. There was nothing my administration was trying to hide or cover up and so I formed a faculty budget advisory committee hoping they could identify specific faculty questions and help clarify the answers. The budget committee was appointed and included senior and some discontented faculty from each department. The group was given access to all of the college and department budget materials. A fatal flaw in my perception of the positive light that information can shed, soon shattered my illusion. Extensive budget spread sheets may become a weapon in the hands of viewers who do not see the overall mosaic of student course requirements, credit hour generation, use of state and local funds, contract commitments and who have a vested interest in particular solutions. So much confidence had been lost that this group did not believe what they were seeing and, given our increasing enrollment, they thought that I should have been able to bring home a greater share of university resources from the administration. In truth, I should have been able to do this if the previous administration had been in place. Another sore and hotly contested issue was the counteroffers I made to keep my administrative staff in place during my year of AERA presidency.

In each FYI newsletter article I reiterated the goals set for the college and the accomplishments of the college toward those goals. Particularly impressive were the number of grants and contracts won with external funding soaring toward eight million dollars. Faculty who were not involved could not see how all of that money was helping the college. They could not understand that external funds were supporting over 100 graduate students without whom their jobs might be in peril. Our administrations' accomplishments were countered with subversive memos to all faculty and lecturers reporting how the dean's office was ripping them off. Never mind that the budget figures distributed were not correct. At this point they were winning converts because for two years there had not been any salary raises except for counteroffers to faculty critical to our programs. To meet the problem head on, being a confronter and believing that open communication is the best way to answer questions and solve problems, I held town meetings in November and December. Unfortunately, this allowed the dissenters a platform to shout down my supporters. My supporters were primarily some associate and vulnerable untenured assistant professors, women and minorities; all dependent on senior faculty for promotions.

In late January, the central administrator distributed the ballots for my fourth year review to the faculty. Our college faculty includes 105 tenure lines and about 85 lecturers. All of these had a vote. While I knew all of the tenured faculty by name and expertise, I knew few of the lecturers. The lecturers only knew that they had not received raises and were fed the sour grist of the rumor mill. Too few of them knew that my administration had led a valiant effort to raise their pay scale, a proposal which was still being considered. I had made too little effort to keep them informed. The vote was taken in February 1995 and the count not reported until early April. The vote did not go well for me. Written comments were mean spirited reporting, duplicity of my administration, poor management of budget, lack of decisive action, and favoritism shown toward women and minorities. There was little mention of the strides our college had made towards accomplishing the goals set by the president when I was hired. These goals included:

Significantly increase external funding

In 1990 external sources yielded our college approximately one million dollars per year. Each year that figure increased until 1994 that figure exceeded eight million.

Improve the quality of the doctoral programs and tenure promotion standards

In 1990 we had two degrees in jeopardy of losing their state accreditation. Program improvements were implemented and now all doctoral programs are in good standing. Our NCATE review was positive in all areas. In 1990, third year reviews were optional and each department followed their own routine for developing portfolios. In the fall of my first year three faculty were not granted tenure or promotion. A review revealed that they had not received third year reviews or consistent feedback. To stabilize our tenure and review process, we now have a mandatory three year review and a specific format for portfolios.

Increase national visibility

In 1990, approximately twelve faculty from our college presented at AERA. In 1995, our faculty and students presented in more than fifty AERA sessions. Our research dollars had increased so that for the first time our college was nationally ranked by *US News and World Report.*

Increase the minority student and faculty presence in the college

Each semester the number of minority students enrolled in the college increased by one percent of the college total enrollment. This was accomplished through the establishment of the Office of Minority Student Services and through a $1,000,000 Endowed Minority Student Scholarship Fund. In 1990, there were only two minority scholarships; today, there are over fifty.

Increase the leadership opportunities for women and minorities

In 1990 there were no women or minorities in leadership positions in our college. During my administration there were women department heads, associate heads and a woman associate dean. The central administration agreed that what had been asked of me had been accomplished in spades. Unfortunately, the criteria for my position established when I was hired, held little meaning for the faculty who rated me up or out on very different dimensions. I have come to understand that most faculties want a dean to facilitate their needs and ideas, not someone to lead in new directions. I feel very akin to Gary Fenstermacher as he writes of his experience in his article, "From Camelot to Chechnya: The journey of an education dean and describes the discrepancy between the administration's expectations and the faculty's expectations." This is a perilous tight rope walk for all deans.

A good friend tried to discourage me from taking this job. He said, "All the organizational structure and programs you implemented as an administrator, can so quickly be dismantled by the next dean. Whereas, the research you accomplished and published is a permanent contribution." He was right, but I had to try. Some things were worth doing. We established a Minority Student Service Center and were able to get it endowed along with one million dollars in minority scholarships. We have been increasing our minority enrollment by 1% each semester. This will be hard to dismantle. The annual Round Table honoring teachers will probably continue, because it is a good fund raiser. The liberated Faculty Advisory will continue to contribute practical and essential ideas about how best to run the college. Hopefully, the field-based teacher education programs will not slip back to the old in class single subject lecture mode. Our Goodlad Center may be discontinued and that would be regrettable.

Throughout the summer my sense of fair play was wounded, my ego was injured and my feelings of self-worth were in question. I have never lost a job and this was a humanizing lesson to learn. A lid was on my feelings. I could feel no passion, no poems, no paintings. My daughter said, "If *you have* let them rob you of even a little piece of your soul that is a loss." The job isn't a loss, but a new opportunity. Such Wisdom!

There has been kindness, support, and accolades from many unexpected quarters as well as the ladies of the club. Several foundations asked that I continue to manage their funds. The college development council with whom I have worked closely for five years have established an endowed Jane Stallings Student Service Scholarship. The staff came forward with a plaque of appreciation. Together we had established their first staff council, staff recognition awards and provided many new opportunities for development. During the summer, several universities asked me to apply for positions as dean, provost and endowed chairs. While I had been deeply honored, it seems best for me to establish the Center for the Study and Implementation of Collaborative Learning Communities and complete some programs we have started at Texas A&M. I have always had a hard time giving up before a task is finished.

For the first time in my life I went on development leave. I am grateful for the time to reflect and catch up with my field. Fall 1995, finds me at Howard University in Washington, D.C. with their team of researchers leading their National Office of Educational Research and Improvement At Risk Center. The questions the students and faculty raise and the approaches they are using are fresh. What a pleasure to be among them.

So now I ask, "Why did I allow myself to be tortured during the past year?" I could have stepped down with the first winds of dissent. It seems I had to try. I could not just roll over and quit. That seemed like acknowledging that all we were working toward for the past four years held no value. During my second and third year as dean, the university was under state audit and close scrutiny from the district attorney's office. Through an internal audit we found several senior people in positions of authority were involved in some near-malfeasance and self-serving activities. They were quietly asked to resign from positions but were not fired. Their response was anger at not being defended by me. They perceived me as weak. Less egalitarian deans may well have fired them and perhaps saved their deanships.

In retrospect, I recognized too late how little senior people had to gain from the changes coming to the college and how much they perceived they were losing in personal, professional prestige and financial satisfaction. I should have been more appreciative and respectful of their long term investments in program development. The power wielded by a threatened and relentless senior professor brother and sisterhood is significant. Given my philosophical underpinnings, I truly thought that rational ideas based upon facts and doing the right thing for students would eventually rule the day if I just hung in there.

And it is now over. Most likely, in several years, I will understand how this seeming travesty fits into the perfect design of my life. Actually, in retrospect, I wouldn't have done anything very different, except maybe cancel the town meetings and the budget committee. This event is somewhat like having our house upon Pagemill Road in San Motro Co., California slide down the hill. That disaster prompted me to accept a position Bill Hawley offered me at Vanderbilt. Without that experience, I could not have become the department head at the University of Houston, the Dean at TAMU, the President of AERA, or the Director of our new Center for the Study and Implementation of Collaborative Learning Communities. Several high energy, creative scholars representing four departments are serving as senior associates. With our combined external available funds, the Center started with a million plus dollars, not a bad beginning. Other good news is that the interim dean is a minority woman who is carrying forth many of the programs we started.

My head feels cleared, I don't feel driven, and I am ready to let my ideas and thoughts flow where they will. I think there is a poem or a story lurking at the edges of my awareness. It has been said, "Yesterday is history, tomorrow is a mystery, and today is a present. That is why we call it the present."

Was the detour through the wonder world of the deanship worth taking? Yes indeed, and there is a very good afterlife.

REFERENCES

Fenstermacher, G.D. (in press). From Camelot to Chechnya: The journey of an education dean. In L.S. Brown (Ed.), *The wizards of odds: Leadership journeys of education deans*. Washington, DC: American Associate of College of Teacher Education.

Graduate Schools of Education. (1995, April). *U.S. News and World Report*, 70-71.

chapter 4

Deaning at a Historically Black Institution: Challenges, Opportunities, and Promise

Portia H. Shields
Albany State University

INTRODUCTION

Approximately 1,300 institutions of higher education (IHEs) train teachers in this country. One hundred and seventeen of these institutions enroll a predominantly African American population, and close to 100 identify themselves as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Traditionally Black Colleges, or Historically Black Institutions (HBIs) (NAFEO, 1994). Noticeably missing from the national and international education scene, associations inform the profession, are African American deans from HBCU's and, indeed, there are few African American deans at all. Further, one would unlikely find HBCU deans who do come to the forums making major presentations, leading discussion groups and serving on association boards or task forces. I believe it is fair to conclude that, on the whole, HBCU education deans are not power brokers among their peers in higher education. A recent National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) report identified 40 public four-year HBIs and 46 private four-year HBI colleges and universities, 84 of which offer teacher education programs (NCES, 1992). Twenty-one of these HBCU's offer advanced degrees and Howard University claims distinction as the largest and only research one HBCU institution in the world (Dilworth, 1994; Hawkins, 1994).

This chapter describes challenges and opportunities of being a dean at an HBI. For this task, it was necessary to make several comparisons between majority institutions and HBIs, and to characterize both. It is important not to overgeneralize either group. Just as there is tremendous diversity among majority schools, HBIs, although intimately linked through history and mission, nevertheless are also quite diverse. The opinions expressed reflect my personal experiences in higher education and are contextualized by conversations with African American, other minority and white education deans, as well as African American education deans who have worked in both traditionally white schools and HBIs, as well as deans of schools other than education. The chapter first provides a view of the HBCU landscape. This information is germane because these perspectives rarely get shared in the broader segments of the academic community and certain misconceptions persist. Next, I make observations about HBCU deaning in general and HBCU education deaning in particular. Finally, I describe my Howard University deaning experience, including the wonderful assistance I received, and offer a vision for HBCU leadership in the future.

HBCU OVERVIEW

The 1954 *Brown vs. Board* decision heralded sweeping changes at HBCUs. Not only did the decision result in a shift in enrollment away from mostly black toward mostly white institutions, the more highly academically qualified students and faculty were (and still are) widely recruited by majority schools able to provide more attractive financial incentives. HBIs, unable to compete or match scholarship awards, also provided fewer program majors. At the same time, fields virtually closed to minority groups because of segregation policies began opening slowly, and by the early 1980s many African American students who would have chosen teaching opted instead for programs leading to careers in corporate America. At Howard University, teacher education appeared to suffer the greatest loss in this regard. Even though HBCUs and majority institutions required similar grade point averages and secondary school curricula, educational background and educationally enhancing experiences of many African American students remained variable. Thus, some HBCU students were left unprepared for course work at entry and unable to pass national examinations leading into education professions upon graduation. As a result, some education programs at HBIs (and, indeed, some HBIs themselves) were threatened with merger or closure—a sure way of closing off the main conduit to academic and economic progress for vast numbers of African American students. Fortunately, most HBIs instituted comprehensive changes, which, along with increased federal and state funding brought about by political agitation primarily from African American leadership, saved most HBCUs from extinction. Despite the appearance of equity in funding from state budgets, however, use of resources in many HBIs differed as some attempted to play "catch up" from past inequitable appropriations. Even so, HBCUs successfully established higher admission and exit requirements, created important pre-college preparation and retention initiatives, aligned programs to meet current national certifying standards, and required passage of national teacher examinations for graduation. This reform led to an increase in percentages of African American graduates certifying for education fields. Today, for example, National Teacher Examination (NTE) pass rates at many HBCUs mirror those of majority institutions with many posting NTE pass rates between 70 and 95 percent (Garibaldi, 1990).

Historically, HBIs have always supplied the greatest numbers of African American teachers who, in turn, bore responsibility for preparing the African American leadership in the world. For example, one can hardly imagine an enlightened society without scores of Howard University graduates who credit teachers for pushing them to the fullest extent of their abilities. A few of my favorites include: E. Franklin Frazier, Thurgood Marshall, Zora Neale Hurston, Kenneth Clark, Toni Morrison, Ossie Davis, and Vernon Jordon. Teachers helped guide these legends in their struggle against legal segregation of days past. Today, educators must help students deflect a more insidious, subtle form of racial divisiveness and open retrenchment from affirmative gains made in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.

Recently, more and more African American students are selecting HBIs as their institution of choice. In 1988 for example, HBIs enrolled 240,000 students and in 1993, 283,000 (*Digest of Education Statistics*, 1995). Some cite negative experiences at integrated elementary and secondary schools for their decision. Others were encouraged by HBCU alumni parents (some parents insisted!) or transferred from majority institutions because they felt isolated, neglected or devalued somehow. Students described disparate advising and mentoring, as well as dissolving race relations on campus as reasons for transferring and for the decision to enter the teaching profession. One male student recalled it this way: "The professor said he couldn't understand what I was trying to say, that I appeared to be mumbling." A female student returned to her dorm on the second day at a majority school to find a sign on her door: "Nigger go home." Another male student cited the misinformation faculty routinely gave to students about African American contributions to U.S. and world history. Still another said that, as the only African American student in most of his high school classes, he was called upon to explain the black view on each important issue. When he came to Howard, he related, he found it initially unsettling having African Americans as instructors. Standing at the top of the hill where, below, the annual freshman picnic was in full sway, I overheard this from an entering student: "I've never seen so many black people in my life." As we talked I found out that he lived in a suburb of Washington, D.C., not 15 miles from our main campus.

Increasing racial insensitivity is only one reason for increased enrollment at HBIs. Another is cost. In general, HBI students pay about half the amount of tuition majority schools charge; and, because the majority of African Americans live well below middle class socioeconomic levels, low cost creates added incentive to apply. More important, even if nonminority schools were entirely "user friendly" and costs were not a factor, most African American students would not apply. Some have not been prepared to compete and they very well know it; some are well qualified but do not feel confident that they can make it. It is some teachers and, unfortunately, parents, who communicate this message. By now it is well established that vast inequity exists in the way education is delivered to students in America. The gap in achievement between white and black children in this country is its living testimony and is as much a reflection of instructional practice as it is of socioeconomic status. Limited technology and other teaching tools indicative of schools in poor communities certainly impact educational outcomes. Students without the home reinforcement of concepts presented in class, who fear for their safety or whose health needs are not addressed, will soon fall behind their more advantaged counterparts. Most important, however, yet less researched in the academy, are effects of lower expectations for achievement and perception of less ability in African American youth, that cause teachers to lower standards but award high grades to students who come to school regularly, try hard, and don't make trouble. Clearly, there are teachers who don't care or who have given up. Likewise, there are those who like the students, yet feel sorry for them and, therefore, accept excuses and poor quality of work. I call this "loving them to death" because the effect is the same. Delpit (1993) posits:

> Students must be taught the codes needed to participate fully in the mainstream of American life, not by being forced to attend to hollow, inane, decontextualized subskills, but rather within the context of meaningful communicative endeavors; that they must be allowed the resource of the teacher's expert knowledge, while being helped to acknowledge their own "expertness" as well; and that even while students are assisted in learning the culture of power, they must also be helped to learn about the arbitrariness of those codes and about the power relationships they represent. (p. 45)

Thus, whether delivered as a hidden curriculum or enacted through a culture of power, by the time African American students reach college preparatory classes in secondary school, many bright students do not see themselves capable of a more rigorous mathematics, science and English curriculum and, therefore, devote only marginal attention to their studies. In fact, even though graduation rates are up, and drop-out rates for African American students are down, and although African American students have made substantial gains on SAT and ACT, they remain below white students on all three criteria (McBay, 1992). For some, college is not the overriding concern; completing high school is. According to NCES (1994), *A Profile of the American High School Sophomore in 1990*, "Sophomores in the lowest SES group are the least likely to report that they are very sure of graduating (77 percent). Sophomores in the highest SES group are most likely to report the same (at 93 percent)" (p. 74). Also, "Black sophomores are the group most likely to report they probably will not or are very sure they will not graduate" (p. 75). HBCUs provide a safety net, and many of these same students who persevere, take enabling programs such as Upward Bound, and demonstrate leadership potential, are accepted at HBIs and do well—although academic raw talent when they enter—and are prepared to contribute to society when they graduate. It is for these compelling reasons that HBIs must be maintained, fully funded, and regarded as the cherished foundation of black intelligencia.

Visitors to an HBI would be immediately impressed with the sense of community spirit and welcoming campus atmosphere. They may be surprised, however, to find little political distance between most education schools and other campus units as exists at some majority institutions where education schools are afforded lesser status.

In size, HBCUs enroll a range of 300 to 12,000 students. Most HBCUs are located in the South, where the majority of the students live. Students demonstrate respect for teachers and others in authority, provide more community service than their counterparts, and are more demonstrably religious. Behavior codes (and in some instances dress codes) at HBIs are strictly enforced, students have less independence of movement and free time, and less flexibility in course options. Recognizing that many students have been educationally disadvantaged, HBCUs offer a rigorous general studies curriculum that leaves few important exposure points to chance and affords few electives. HBIs then add their own Afrocentric curriculum, which might take the form of weekly sessions with African American leadership from around the world, required course work on the Black Diaspora, or weekly informal sessions with the university president such as are held at Central State University. HBIs also require students to participate in formal ceremonies designed to introduce or reconnect them to African American history, culture, and legacy of achievement. Moreover, instructors assign students opportunities for connecting leadership and responsibility to African Americans and other minorities through their course work. Further, faculty, dedicated to the mission, teach an average of four classes per semester, yet are able to extend their nurturing and mentoring to practically a parenting level. Part of the model demands "tough love," as time lines are held constant, and few excuses tolerated. On the other hand, faculty take genuine personal interest in students. In addition, it is not uncommon for faculty to have regular communication with parents; to counsel students well beyond advising hours, to encourage students to seek programs leading to several career paths; and to locate scholarships, paid internships and graduate opportunities for them. Encouraging, exposing, supporting, expecting, and demanding the best, HBCUs are learning communities whose graduates are given credit for self esteem and risk-taking attributes, which can propel them past the survival orientation to success, not only in their careers, but in graduate and post graduate training—often at traditionally white institutions.

DEANING AT AN HBCU

HBCU deans are very important, highly regarded administrators on campus and in the community. They present a professional demeanor, particularly toward standards of dress and protocol. Deans speak to colleagues with proper title and deference for rank. It is the prevailing belief that addressing faculty by title provides incentive for students, and shows respect for the effort of getting the terminal degree. Because African Americans enter doctoral programs later in their careers, HBCU deans are older. The majority of deans are male and, because there is less job turnover, they remain deans longer than those at other IHEs.

Deans at HBCUs suffer from the same financial problems as do deans at majority institutions. The effect at HBCUs, however, is decidedly more grave, making the job more difficult with more to do. Because their schools are generally smaller, HBCU deans do not have the luxury of a number of associate and assistant deans. And HBIs are not heavily endowed with foundation or federal support (Dilworth, 1994). In addition, because fewer HBCU graduates are at the high end of the income scale, they are unable to give as much money as majority alumni contribute to their institutions. Instead, it is believed that HBI alumni contribute their resources to assist other family members in the quest for higher education. Operating with less support staff and discretionary funds, HBI deans must keep track of their own budgets, do their own development and participate in much of their schools' grant writing. HBI deans who enjoy success give much of the credit to faculty and staff who cooperate as family, doing what it takes to get the work done.

Funding limitations make resources such as technology harder to obtain and keep current, recruitment of excellent students and faculty more challenging; and virtually eliminate funds for travel. On the surface, limited travel would appear an unimportant academic obstacle. Less travel, however, translates into less interaction with colleagues on important educational issues, particularly those where there is need for multicultural perspectives, and inequitable access for research and funding priorities, which are often discussed at national meetings. In addition, to the extent that networking across IHEs and education agencies contributes to a strong research agenda and accesses technical assistance for grant proposals, schools that collaborate can frame stronger research proposals, receive more funding support, and contribute more publications. HBCU researchers, unable to travel, remain "out of the loop" in these endeavors. The unfortunate consequence accrues to all educators because valuable multicultural perspectives and research opportunities that would contribute solutions to problems affecting the majority of Americans are missed. For example, recent legislation calling for zeroing out federal assistance in favor of block grants to states portends a chilling outcome for families that depend on federal entitlements. Financial aid for college-bound students, child care, nutrition, immunization, substance abuse and neglect services, education reform programs is under attack. During current less economically prosperous times coupled with a growing national mood of conservatism in America, multicultural alliances will have to be formed if our country intends to reduce the ever widening gap between middle and lower echelons of society. Therefore, while majority institutions are seeking to enroll students representative of population demographics in America and are making some progress in this regard, HBCUs are enrolling, preparing and graduating African Americans and other minorities in ever increasing numbers. Simply, it is part of the mission of each HBI to do so. Howard University's mission statement provides an illuminating example:

> The mission of Howard University as a comprehensive, research-oriented, predominantly African-American university is to provide an educational experience of exceptional quality at reasonable cost to students of high academic potential. Particular emphasis is placed upon providing educational opportunities for African-American men and women and for other historically disenfranchised groups. Furthermore, Howard University is dedicated to attracting, sustaining, and developing a cadre of faculty who,

> through their teaching and research, are committed to producing distinguished and compassionate graduates who seek solutions to human and social problems in the United States and throughout the world. (*Facts 1995*, Howard University, 1995, p. 3)

EDUCATION DEANING AT AN HBCU

Although they represent only 7 percent of the nation's teacher education programs, HBCUs are responsible for producing between two-thirds and three-fourths of all black teachers. As important, 44 percent of all teacher education students are enrolled in HBIs (Hawkins, 1994). HBCU graduates are also more likely than their white counterparts to work in low income neighborhoods and in schools attended by large percentages of minority populations. This is noteworthy as the latest AACTE RATE survey (1994) revealed that in 1992, slightly more than half of teacher education candidates surveyed nationwide definitely preferred to work with middle income students and only three in 10 indicated a preference for low income settings. Forty-nine percent said they would not consider working with non-English speaking students. Among the institutions responding, only three were HBCUs. "In terms of definite preferences," the report noted, "30 percent of the sample opted for a school setting comprised primarily of historically underrepresented populations" (RATE, p. 21). Notwithstanding the higher quality of graduates and their willingness to work in all kinds of schools, many HBCU education schools and departments remain underfunded, underenrolled, underresourced and subject to unfavorable and unfair comparison to white education schools and colleges—all while doing more, with less. The education deans at HBCUs then are subject to challenges unlike others:

- remaining viable through accrediting arms, notwithstanding resource limitations;
- contributing to the nation educational reform movement from the home institution, away from colleagues;
- carefully selecting which national education organizations to belong to and taking time required to be away from work to take part, despite mounting cost;
- recruiting excellent students;
- recruiting and retaining qualified faculty with sufficient resources and including support for research, writing, travel and faculty development;
- exposing students to a variety of multicultural experiences that increase minority and nonminority students' understanding of diversity within and among different racial, ethnic and cultural groups;

- deepening debate on issues germane to people of color.

African American deans, able to balance these priorities and do traditional deaning tasks, are achieving mightily against the odds.

It is precisely because the country is faced with the demographic that soon the nation will educate almost 50 percent minorities, with even higher percentages expected in large urban areas (mostly Hispanic and African American), it is imperative for teachers who reflect understanding of different cultural perspectives to be prepared. The entire teaching force must be able to present an internationally focused education, not only history, geography and language but also in literature and science where the contributions of all people, as well as the social and political obstacles, are reflected in the curriculum. Inherent in the preparation is fostering the ability of teachers to contribute to and capitalize on cultural strengths of all learners while instilling a strong racial identity needed by African American children during their critical grade-school years to counterbalance the stress they will naturally live with as minorities in the United States (Spencer, 1986).

Likewise, minority children must see teachers who look like them acting as beacons of comfort that encourage others to follow and make similar contributions to the field. Delpit (1993) states the case: "Appropriate education for poor children and children of color can only be devised in consultation with adults who share their culture" (p. 45). In frank terms, African American education deans have the responsibility to recruit and prepare a cadre of excellent teachers capable of working in all places where there are children, but especially African American and other minority children for whom educational equity has not been the rule, and we simply do not have enough qualified students in the applicant pool. HBCU education deans are directly responsible for creating innovative mechanisms that attract the brightest students to a profession where salaries, although recently raised by 2 percent, remain low at entry. Almost 70 percent of African American college students receive a form of financial aid and at HBIs, the percentage is even higher (Ellis, 1995).

For HBCU education deans, recruiting places us on the horns of a dilemma unlike our counterpart deans, whose teacher education application pool is deeper and more expansive, if mostly white. HBCU deans recognize that a growing number of males (and females) have succumbed to mounting societal pressures (a recent news report confirmed that, for the first time, there are more African Americans males ages 18–24 in jail than in college) and are no longer viable candidates for teacher education; that the pool of qualified students is indeed dwindling; and, because of past racial injustices, excellent students must not only be allowed, but encouraged, to pursue other, more exotic fields of interest and of choice. We must not make them bear guilt over their career choices. At the same time, it is our responsibility to enhance the quality of education for African American children and youth and ensure that there will be talented students in the education pipeline—students who will not lose the way to educational and economic parity. Loan forgiveness programs help and tuition scholarships encourage, but at present, they do not seem sufficient to attract excellent students in sufficient numbers. HBCU deans must therefore begin to target students who may not be as academically prepared and provide a quality precollege-throughout-college student instructional support system that leads to the education profession without sacrificing quality and without additional financial burden to the student or to the institution. They must make this happen in the shortest span of time necessary as, even with financial aid, lack of sufficient resources and support cause most African American students to leave college or take longer to complete their degrees than their white counterparts. This is especially true for students who matriculate in high-cost cities.

Concurrently, African American deans must negotiate competitive salaries for teaching specialties in short supply (science education, for example); administer a range of education programs (Howard's School of Education offers 47 education degrees); seek funding from foundations, state and federal agencies; support and reward excellent instruction; help ensure a nurturing campus life; and engage students in multicultural experiences that deepen their understanding of and respect for different cultures, religions, and ethnicities. Additionally, they must contribute substantially to local schools and community groups and support faculty, staff, and student development services. HBCU deans indeed must do more with less and must do it creatively with level or even less funding. These myriad challenges compel HBCU deans to keep their feet to the fire, to remain at their schools, in the community or travel mainly to conduct fund-raising. This level of a more "hands on" involvement offers little time for networking and colloquy. The hard work has paid off through the success of their graduates. In addition to improved graduation rates and program quality, HBCU schools of education have also added substantially to their number of federally funded research and training projects. The schools focus on what they do best—increasing the number professionals in the discipline and preparing graduates for post graduate education and future leadership.

Therefore, as nonminority institution deans also experience varying degrees of financial support and prestige on their campus, they nevertheless, when seeking grants, are able to shift more easily from the home institution to form collaborations with others with whom they regularly interact at national meetings. HBCUs are more tightly campus-bound. The blessing is that HBCUs are doing good work and it is paying off. The curse is that their achievements are not celebrated in the broader community. Troubling, too, is an undercurrent implying that, because they are not major players at national education policy making groups, somehow their programs contain impediments and are less academically rigorous. All the while, HBIs, against the odds, continue "to achieve beyond their means, advancing not just individuals but also communities as well" (Dilworth, 1994, p. 129).

Deaning at Howard University

Howard University is a 128-year-old institution chartered under special Congressional authority in 1867. From its 16 schools and colleges, 2,250 ethnically diverse faculty offer 139 degree programs to more than 11,000 graduate and undergraduate students—68 percent African American, 21 percent Caucasian, 1 percent Latin and 8 percent Asian (*Facts*, 1995). Although geographically placed in the southeast section of the country, Washington, D.C., the nation's capital, is not a southern city in any traditional sense. Our student body comes from 50 states, the territories and 102 countries. Howard University is considered to have the largest number of African American faculty with earned doctorates of any institution of higher learning in the United States. It is believed that Howard has more second, third and fourth generation African American students whose parents are college trained than any other higher education institution. Howard students receive no support from the United Negro College fund. Moreover, Howard consistently ranks in the top 1 percent of major colleges and universities recruiting the highest number of national achievement scholarship recipients (Howard University Office of University Communications, December 11, 1995). To its credit, Howard boasts hiring the first woman dean of a school of dentistry in the United States and the first African American dean at a school of law (Smith, 1993). Currently, women deans head not only education, but also allied health, pharmacy, nursing, and communications. Because it is a comprehensive university, Howard cannot be compared to most HBIs. The university's emphasis on research, accompanied by the "publish or perish" doctrine, as it faces financial and other resource obstacles places Howard faculty in an ever-mounting struggle to maintain the institution's research-one designation and retain its historical status as the top HBCU at the same time. Moreover, the excellence with which our sister schools are conducting the business of educating and nurturing African American and other minority students, and under threat of an impending severe reduction in our federal appropriation, the premier African American institution in the world faces challenges unlike ever before. Today, our school is in fierce competition for the brightest faculty and students, not only from majority schools but from our HBCU sisters as well. From discussions with my colleague deans, who have been so helpful, it has become clear that being a dean is hard work. The consensus is also that deaning at an HBI is even harder. I will not attempt to characterize the job of dean at Howard University as the hardest. However, Howard deans share the challenges and opportunities of both HBIs and nonminority schools. Most importantly, we also share the possibilities.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF DEANING AT HOWARD

Three years ago I began my career as dean at Howard. Information about a New Deans Institute arrived in the mail. I was excited that I could be trained and thus make fewer on-the-job mistakes. It was my plan to attend. Returning from the Howard University College of Medicine where I served as Director of Medical Education, I was surprised by the number of medical faculty who, when they called to wish me well, said they were unaware that Howard still had a School of Education. For me, those were my most defining moments because it identified a priority to add to my list: contributing a sense of stability in the unit, maintaining the quality of our academic and auxiliary programs, obtaining funding to support students and faulty, upgrading staff functions and pay, facilitating innovative research, programmatic and recruitment initiatives, enhancing the image of the school, and making a significant contribution to our campus and the community and seeing to it that the world "got the news."

Having experienced a number of deans in rapid succession (four deans in five years), faculty were understandably skeptical when I arrived. I immediately abandoned all plans to leave the campus for dean school and immediately set about to convince them that indeed change was possible. With cooperation from Physical Facilities Management, the building was refurbished, art work reflecting diversity in America placed on the walls, and photographs depicting the evolution of our school placed where students could make important historical connections. Then, we got busy people even busier writing grant proposals. Next came the important step of meeting and getting to know deans on campus and education deans in the city, and establishing ties with deans around the country. In this effort, I received great assistance from national organizations: National Black Child Development Institute

(NBCDI), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Universities (ACSESULGC), American Psychological Association (APA), The Holmes Group, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), Project 30 Alliance, American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Council of Great City Colleges of Education. Momentum toward increasing campus presence picked up through joint grant projects with the school of Social Work, The College of Arts and Sciences, The College of Nursing, The School of Engineering, and The College of Allied Health Sciences. We even wrote a proposal with The School of Divinity. Then, we began collaborating on grant projects with our sister HBIs and majority institutions.

To our Center for Academic Reinforcement, we added a computerized "Opportunity Center" to assist students who wanted to review information independently on-site and in the dormitory. We also created a mini site for our university athletes. Our preschool operations expanded to include kindergarten, and instructors began exposing the children to the other academic units and including them in formal ceremonies (Convocation, Observance of Charter Day, the conferring of an honorary degree on President Mandella, for example). With these youngsters as emissaries, word that a vibrant School of Education exists has definitely spread throughout the district. Moreover, this year we entered into our first Professional Development School partnership, the Katie C. Lewis Elementary School, which is designed to improve science instruction for the children in the school and our students as well. Just recently we extended our Professional Development services to include Maryland's Prince George and Montgomery County public schools. At the same time, we initiated our APA, NASDTEC, and NCATE self-study efforts.

COLLEAGUES ASSISTING COLLEAGUES

Most HBCU deans find their work exciting and rewarding; however, they also agree that the work cannot be accomplished without help from colleague deans both at the institution and around the country. Deans at Howard do not compete with one another and, instead, support each other's programs. They understand the important role of education in increasing capacity in their own students, and have dedicated a portion of their unit resources to assist with the work of our school when needed.

From my colleagues and personal experience, I have learned six very important deaning axioms. At an HBI:

- *The desired behavior must be modeled*: I therefore come to work, and remain at work every day I can. When a faculty member is needed for a task, I make personal contact before writing a memorandum. I try to project behavior that suggests that faculty and staff can depend on me. Obviously, I have overdone this as during my first year, I was dubbed the "hands-on" dean. I should have gone to the new dean's institute.
- *Humor is essential*: At Howard, deans are dignified, serious people. However, at some meetings, the men (never the women) poke fun at one another and we all share a bit of laughter together. It releases some of the tension we also share. My colleague deans assure me that sometime laughter is the only logical solution. This was confirmed the day I was informed of a "mouse problem" in the building and asked for an exterminator to be contacted. While I was on a conference call with several education deans across the country, the door to my office opened slowly and in came an exterminator with a mouse trap in his right hand and one in his left. He smiled, and so as not to disturb my call, tiptoed over to the opposite side of the room and placed the traps strategically in two corners. It was only when he turned around with a "well that's taken care of" look on his face that I lost control and exploded with laughter. I am sure the other deans wondered what caused the outburst as I calmed myself and proceeded with the discussion.
- *One must be prepared to do all kinds of work*: A colleague from the Howard's Medical School called the other day, gave his name and asked to speak with me. When I came directly to the telephone, he said "Wow, I couldn't have gotten through to my own dean this quickly." I responded, "If you had called me ten minutes earlier, I would have answered the phone." Faculty, staff and students work hard. I must do no less.
- *You will never finish dean's work*: At first, I prided myself on remaining at work each day until all the work on the desk was cleared or in process. While away at meetings, materials needing attention were placed on my desk. When I returned from each campus meeting, I brought work and placed it on my desk. Soon, I was coming into the office on Saturdays to clear the stacks of papers from my desk. Then Sundays. Finally, I consulted my colleagues who advised me: "Keep pulling from the top of the pile."
- *Everybody will not love you*: As I embarked on my administrative responsibilities, I introduced some strategies I believed would stimu-

late faculty involvement and promote congeniality and esprit de corps. I soon learned that I did not have cooperation from everyone, nor did everyone appreciate my efforts. Initially, I was crushed and thought it was because I had not explained myself well. Perhaps I hadn't given them enough opportunity for input, did not articulate a clear vision for the school, or did not relate the vision I thought we had developed together to the mission of the unit or the university. I agonized over this and then consulted my colleague deans. It was they who assured me that I must get my work accomplished at Howard and my love at home. I have come to accept this, though I continue working at it. There is more collegiality today than yesterday. There will be more tomorrow.

- *Find joy*: The weight of administration at the level of dean at Howard University takes constant enthusiasm and enormous energy. One must find the personal power to manage the intensity required of some of the work, handle myriad problems—large and minute—and, simultaneously, contribute something positive to the profession each day. In the beginning of my tenure, I would sometimes become discouraged, thinking that the work was just too hard, or had the feeling that I was the only one who understood or was concerned about the School of Education. In addition, because Howard is a larger school, I feel compelled, perhaps more than other deans, to represent not only my institution, but to promote my sister HBCUs as well. This self-imposed ethic sometimes adds stress. A colleague dean I confided in advised me that this was normal dean doldrums and advised me that when an attack comes on, to get up and take a walk and get a fresh view. She was right. Now, when I feel mired in responsibility, I walk to the Early Learning Program and listen to the five-year-olds saying a poem in Spanish, or have the two-year-olds explain what a mouse does to the computer. Or, I may visit the PDS to observe my students and the children learning and teaching. Sometimes I merely walk into one of the education classes to hear an excellent professor explaining "t" tests to eager and responsive students. This has proven to be an ideal way to regain focus, strength and determination. Through these brief escapes, I find joy that lasts a very long time.

HBCUS INTO THE FUTURE

Over the past 20 years majority institutions have made genuine efforts to enroll African American and other minorities into teacher education programs and have been successful. Fifty-six percent of African Americans in teacher education programs are at majority schools. HBCU deans believe that, notwithstanding impending budget cuts in programs affecting poor and minorities that threaten to leave African Americans less well prepared for postsecondary education, it is a shared moral imperative for majority schools to try to maintain a diverse student body. They will attempt to hire a more diverse faculty than is currently in place and will also seek to place more African American deans than the present group of about deans currently leading education schools in traditionally white institutions. But quite simply, given the political and social climate in America today, African American youth cannot count on a place in a majority education program the way they can at an HBCU. For HBCU deans, this creates a mandate for us to retain and strengthen our programs so as to prepare skilled, dedicated and knowledgeable professionals for all fields, classroom teachers, and university faculty. We must also mentor and develop faculty and student leaders capable of framing public policy; contributing a new, more useful education agenda; developing and implementing anti-bias curricula; and assuming school and community leadership as a rite of passage through our institutions. For HBCUs this is more than a moral issue. It is a just cause that bears directly on the future of our race. We deans, therefore, must intensify our efforts, connect our strategies and bring our collective resources to bear directly on preparing a critical mass of talented, dedicated African Americans for the future. And we must continue to take care of each other and not tire, as each day at our institutions, HBCU deans are looking into the eyes of future leaders of America, aware, prepared, and eager to serve.

It is also important to recognize that, because institutions of higher education must be able to accommodate needs and expectations of an increasingly diverse faculty and student body, there could be no better resource than an HBCU. HBCUs enroll and employ a more ethnically diverse student and faculty population than nonminority institutions (Dilworth, 1994). If education deans at majority institutions and HBCUs collaborated on teaching, research and service projects, they would be making a collegial investment sure to lead to increased understanding, appreciation, and respect for diversity through natural—not artificial—associations. As important, they would apply their collective priorities in addressing research questions important to the entire academy. This is not a remarkable idea but one that would add cultural integrity to research projects from connected sources, schools that gain power from one another. Some of these activities are being accomplished, but not enough. Collaboration is also sure to enhance the development of an enlarged pool of student and faculty instructors and researchers able and willing to strengthen both HBCUs and majority institutions, and promote a "leveling of the academic playing field."

Today, exciting changes are taking place in teacher education. These changes present opportunities for institutions to creatively examine and restructure programs in ways that will not only strengthen teachers' subject matter knowledge and pedagogy simultaneously, as called for by Holmes Group and Project 30 Alliance, but also prepare prospective teachers for the multicultural schools in which they will one day have to teach, if they will teach at all. An array of new opportunities for collaborative research and for new discoveries about teaching and learning are emerging. HBCUs have an important contribution to make in this regard.

REFERENCES

Delpit, L. (1993). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.

Dilworth, M. E. (1994). "Historically Black colleges and universities: Taking care of home," *The state of Black America 1994*. New York: The National Urban League, 127–149.

Ellis, P. (1995, November), "Lifestyle of the overloaded," *The Washington Post*, A23.

Facts 1995 (1995). Washington, D.C.: Howard University, Office of the President.

Garibaldi, A. M. (1990). *The revitalization of teacher education programs at historically black colleges: Four case studies*. Southern Education Foundation.

Hawkins, D. (1994, December), "Tradition gives way to change," *Black issues in higher education*, 12–16.

Institutional and presidential profiles of the Nation's historically and predominantly Black colleges and universities (1994). NAFEO.

McBay, S. M. (1992), "The condition of African American education: Changes and challenges," *The state of Black America 1992*. New York: The National Urban League, 141–156.

National Center for Education Statistics (1994, December). *A Profile of the American high school sophomore in 1990*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 74, 75, XI.

National Center for Education Statistics (1995, October). *Digest of education statistics 1995*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 224–226.

National Center for Education Statistics (1992, July). *Historically Black colleges and universities, 1976-90*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

RATE Survey VII, AACTE, 1994.

Smith, J. C., Jr. (1993). *Emancipation: The making of the Black lawyer 1844–1944*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Spencer, M. B. (1986). "Risk and resilience: How Black children cope with stress," *Social science* in *The state of Black America 1991*. (1991). New York: National Urban League, Inc., 102.

part II

Changing Schools: Issues of Power, Conflict, Race, and Gender

chapter 5

A Profession at Risk: Changing the Image and Substance of Teacher Education

Fannie Wiley Preston
Saint Mary's College of California

The future of teacher education is inexorably linked to the goal of equal access and academic success for all students. In order to make this linkage an authentically powerful reality, teacher education needs a change of earthquake proportions. A series of events that are the magnitude of constitutional conventions (Sarason, 1994). Such events would match the proportions of the educational challenges facing us as a nation.

One of Sarason's ideas is to restructure the school governance system. He articulates a principle of parental involvement in the major decisions of schooling. Larry Cuban postulates building on the things that work (Disney Forum, 1994).

John Goodlad (1990) read all the reform reports since 1892 and extracted three concomitant themes: 1. teachers need more general education, 2. teachers need an academic major, 3. beginning teachers need mentors. To John Goodlad's themes, we can now add two 1994 permutations: 1. a call for standards based, systemic, teacher education reform through professional development, and 2. a "seamless thread" from preservice to inservice education (Schwartz, 1990).

There is a cacophony of voices calling for change and many ideas are being implemented. The teacher education and K–12 musicale program is filled with new and reworked melodies. Strategies change over the years; the reform agenda does not.

Many of the ideas being implemented today are worthwhile. They make a demonstrable contribution to K–12 and teacher education reform. *But, the critical question is, do they have an impact of sufficient magnitude to change public perception of schools and schools of education?*

There are education summits (California Legislature, 1994) and media barrages about the decline of education in the nation. Goals 2000 is being touted as the New Federalism. A professional development standard was added to the goals to make them inclusive of teacher education. The goals are designed to be a catalyst for teacher education and school change.

The Office of Education held hearings (1994) on how it can best support state-based reform. In California, restructuring projects are flourishing: The Coalition for Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools Project, Professional Development Schools. In addition, reform reports are being produced at a steady rate: *It's Elementary, Caught-in-the-Middle, Ready or Not Here They Come, Second to None.*

California passed legislation authorizing charter schools. Nationally, we now have student standards, teacher standards, curriculum standards and opportunity-to-learn standards. The National Standards Board is moving full steam ahead. This scenario is repeated in many different ways throughout the nation. All of this money, energy and brain power is being expended by overworked professionals. *But, the critical question remains, is all of this activity having an impact of sufficient magnitude to change public perception of schools and schools of education? More does not seem to be better. Will anything ever come of all this activity? Perhaps it is time to try "different."*

While teacher educators and school districts are being bombarded with all of these reform initiatives, policy makers and legislators are critically evaluating our educational system. Their critical evaluation, and the decisions shaped by those evaluations, mold the prevailing view and the image of schooling in America. This, in turn, generates negative stress that fragments the profession and distracts us from our common purpose of academic access and success for all students.

The media, the policy makers and the legislators control public opinion. To them, all of our activities are meaningless in the grand scheme of things because they are small and uncoordinated. They do not grab the attention of the public. They do not burrow deeply enough or extend broadly enough. Only a force of equal or greater magnitude of influence can turn the current tide of public opinion in a positive direction, meld public and professional interests, and focus that interest on targeted processes rather than outcomes alone. *That optimal force is a united profession, operating within the frame of large, regional, educational collaboratives in which the partners have jointly hammered out their magna carta.*

These collaboratives are the key that can unlock our potential. The magnitude of the partnership, the force of the ideas, and the combined advocacy groups will demand attention. They provide a safe environment in which to explore new ideas without artificial deadlines. A momentum will be created that cannot be ignored. Each regional collaborative will have a unique identity that is exhibited through programs, approaches, decisions, philosophies and ideas that are different and unique. Kindergarten through 12 schools and institutions of higher education are now one generic blur in the minds of many policy makers—all stamped with one label.

A typical collaborative exists within a specific geographic region and is comprised of two or more institutions of higher education, surrounding school districts, union representatives, parent groups, students and members of the business community. The collaborative is not about immediate proximity. It is about benefitting all children in a geographic area through "collegial affiliation" (Mouton & Blake, 1984).

Within the collaborative, where all of the stakeholders in the educational enterprise are gathered together, an agenda of excellence is carefully crafted. The collaborative's agenda might contain restructuring the teacher education curriculum, establishing model high schools or elementary schools, establishing professional development schools or business partnerships, conducting joint needs assessments and establishing a common research agenda (Bergen, 1992). Because of the inherent communication structures, a symbiotic relationship would emerge among the varied activities. Changes in one area would provide leverage for other changes. The mutual concern for K–12 education is what binds the members of the group together. A common foundation of cross-cultural understanding is built. A common foundation of cross-cultural understanding would be built. Particularly, the members of the collaborative would collectively make their presence known in the community and their voices heard. They would jointly engage the legislature and other policy groups.

Within these nation wide, regionally organized collaboratives (similar to congressional districts), the belief will be fractured that only teacher educators are responsible for the education of teachers and only K–12 educators are responsible for student achievement. Although specific roles and functions will be delineated, both teacher educators and K–12 teachers will be able to move easily between roles. The distinctions among individuals will gradually be blended. There will be a menu of models and practices that each collaborative may choose or adapt.

In the collaborative, reasoning by dialogue, the dialectic conversation is the chief means of investigating, forming concepts and making decisions. Inquiry is the dominant means of resolving problems. Principled negotiation is the primary method for gathering data to reconcile differences and resolve conflicts or contradictory ideas. Within this frame, with the controlled boundaries, all the reform activity is captured and documented. There is a fermentation of ideas and sufficient energy is generated to move the organization forward in powerful ways that impact public and policy maker perceptions.

Changing the interaction between teachers and students is the essence of school and teacher reform. The movement is driven primarily by needs of students. However, this kernel cannot grow until there is some order and saneness to the educational environment.

We, as teachers and teacher educators, know what to do to reform teaching and teacher education. We have the capacity to generate the knowledge and understanding needed to make the regional educational collaborative a reality. The current structures, infrastructures and socio-political contexts are divisive and keep people of like mind apart. They prevent collegial affiliation. Within the socio-political context, our task is to structure ourselves in ways that will enhance the substantive curriculum development process. This new structure will further the creation of a learning, thinking community for students, teachers, teacher educators, administrators, parents and the business community. Then all we will have to do is live through the chaos that results. Collaboration is a messy procedure. School/college partnerships provide the arena for the sharing, the debating and the problem solving needed to meet our current educational challenges. It is the feeling and moving through the pain that transforms us.

Teacher educators and the K-12 school system must re-invent themselves together further linking their agendas with that of the community-at-large. We need to become a coalition of common interests—not separated by arbitrary grade levels and pride of position.

THE PERCEPTUAL MISMATCH

There is a mismatch in perceptions. Using all of the resources available to us, we need to get beyond this mismatch in the perceptions among policy makers, legislators, the broader community and educators. Getting our relationships to a new place is the challenge we face.

The Scenario

I attended a major policy conference in California. At this conference were commissioners, who are analogous to members of a professional standards board, representatives of teacher unions, representatives of the State Board of Education, legislators, school board members and school district representatives. It was an invitational conference with eighty people in attendance. The theme of the conference is not of consequence, but what is of consequence is the dialogue that occurred in three separate contexts.

During the morning, school district personnel repeatedly stated that when they hire new teachers, they inevitably have to retrain them in teaching methodology. They further stated that teachers in the field are the best qualified to train teachers and that practice is the best teacher (the apprenticeship model). There was no reaction from the teacher educators in the group (buried feelings).

Later in the morning we broke into small groups. In the small group I attended, there was a seminal interaction between a legislator from another state and the group members. The legislator made a compelling assertion that paralyzed the group:

> We are putting a lot of money into schools and schools of education. What are you doing with the money we are giving you? You are not delivering, in terms of your mandate, qualified teachers for schools. And, in certain areas, you are not producing enough teachers. Why should we do anything more for you when you are not delivering with what you have?

There was no time for people to respond. We broke for lunch (conscious awareness).

Later on in the afternoon, in a large group setting, a school board member indicated publicly that he had just left a high school the previous day and teachers in that school were not prepared to meet the situations in which they found themselves. He generalized very broadly that the schools of education are not doing their job. Not surprisingly, this school of education bashing tweaked the ire of all teacher educators in the room.

The frustration could be held back no longer. The board member was immediately attacked for painting with such a broad brush (letting it out). It was quickly pointed out to the board member that there are numerous instances of quality teacher education programs that prepare competent professionals. The board member, facing a barrage of hostility, left the room. I am certain he could only see defensiveness.

No one in the group explicitly articulated a solution to the problem of perceptual mismatch—what is being done or what could be done to address the issue of how to change public and policy-maker perceptions. The board member left the room more convinced than ever that teacher educators are not interested in the public's view, not interested in change, defensive of the status quo, and if teacher educators were interested in change, they wouldn't know what to do to resolve our educational problems. All of these conclusions are false. Certainly there is enough fault to go around, but the core of educators are as competent as those in any other profession. They need the opportunity to demonstrate it.

Perhaps the teacher educators present could have generated a set of characteristics and criteria for programs that do prepare teachers well. Or, we might cite one set of accreditation standards. However, the board member, the legislator and the district representatives would easily respond, "Don't tell me, show me." In our current state, "showing them" would mean visitation to one or two isolated schools with wonderful teachers. This is not the point. The point is creating a world class school system, supported by state-of-the-art teacher education institutions. A world in which the non-performing components are the exception and for those there is an aggressive coalition identifying and addressing the problems. Is teacher education really as bad as we are told? Or, is it a matter of miscommunication, misunderstanding and lack of recognition of what is being achieved. Is it a matter of perception? We know what works in teacher education and we know what works in schools. Our frustration is that the only thing we hear about are the negative examples. This can only lead to self-doubt and low morale.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, accredits hundreds of institutions. These institutions must be doing something right. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing approves teacher education institutions in California. Only a small percentage are not accredited in a given year. Aren't these institutions doing something right? Why is it that we are not getting our positive messages out?

Why is it that we are not building on these elements of success? Why do we daily continue to hear declarations of failure? Timothy J. Bergen, Jr. (1991) finds the debate on teacher education heated, but not enlightened.

Teacher educators find the criticism that they are experiencing incredulous. A composite of teacher educators at any given institution expresses it this way:

> This negative reality does not describe me or my institution. I have a career pattern survey that says my students think highly of the program. The district personnel applaud my program and the employers of these graduates find them competent. When I go out and observe my students in classrooms, they are delivering instruction effectively and meeting the needs of students. Who are these critics talking about?
>
> Laymen do not understand the context of teacher education. While teacher education programs are being required to adhere to more and more stringent standards, there are more and more alternative teacher education programs that circumvent these standards or where standards are non-existent.

The policy conference is a passion play about a ubiquitous problem. It is a symbolic reflection of nation-wide attitudes, attitudes and opinions that place teachers and teacher educators on a collision course with public opinion at worst, and the maintenance of the status quo at best. Neither of these alternatives is acceptable. We can always find one or more isolated schools or colleges meeting expectations. But, only actions of sufficient magnitude and a consequence of great societal impact will enjoin the debate.

Teachers and teacher educators within a given region must take charge of the profession by convening their local constitutional convention, establishing a common long term pursuit, breaking down barriers, and demonstrating a willingness to share and collaborate with fiscal and human resources to attain the desired outcomes. Doing what we know how to do in a protected, collective environment can break the chain of negativity and eradicate the malaise.

> We must understand that there are no other issues in education more critical to the survival this nation as a first class culture or as a free and democratic society than excellent...schools and the development of a multicultural teaching force in the elementary, secondary and higher education schools. (Eubanks, 1990)

Reform is possible. We can harness all of the teacher education and school reform efforts within a clear framework, under agreed-upon ground rules, and a willingness to persevere when the going gets rough. Within a regional structure, policy makers and the public can become our partners. We can get to know each other as individuals with strengths and weaknesses. Legislators and policy makers will become constituents of one of the geographic centers. We can jointly build on our strengths while systematically remediating our weaknesses. Along with the regional structure comes a presence of sufficient magnitude, high visibility and accountability.

We have to trust the process. It is sound and time tested. Whether we look at Comer, Levin or Sizer, the process is the thing. The members of the collaborative may not speak with one voice, but they will speak with a coherent, unified voice. Collective voices that have heard one another, have engaged in a process of mutuality and community that leads to an objective delineation of the issues. By being forced to hear a passionate set of arguments, policy makers can make informed decisions.

The current flurry of educational activity and the conferences and networks used to report these activities, is analogous to generating steam and seeing it dissipate into the air. If we generate a lot of steam and there is no train and/or engine to capture and use that steam, nothing is going to happen and we are not going to be able to reach our destination. But, with a train and an engine, you can harness the energy being produced and create forward movement. It might initially be just a "chug, chug, chug" locomotive but, with direction, over time—growing, learning and implementing new ideas, refining existing ones and having a vision of where we want to go—accelerated progress will be made. The primitive locomotive will be eventually transformed into a sleek, modern, bullet train. The train, the framework, is broad-based (the educational collaborative); the steam is all of the promising practices in existence today and the engine is the new kind of leadership that permeates all levels of the organization and keeps everyone's eye on the prize. A leadership style that is committed to principles of symbiotic inclusivity within the profession.

Symbiotic Inclusivity

I translated the work of Mouton and Blake (1984) on adult learning into a model for facilitating change in large complex systems. I have added to it the concept of bringing together all of the stakeholders in the educational enterprise (inclusivity).

Symbiotic Inclusivity is synergism in action, cooperative action of discrete agencies such that the total effect is greater than the sum of the effects taken independently. In a synergogic mode all participants in the enterprise are equally responsible and accountable for the plans, the process and procedures and the outcomes. Change is not top down. The participants are not told what to do by some all-knowing leader. They control their own learning. Learning takes place through collegial interaction. Colleagues are models, sources of information and guides in the resolution of problems. The responsibility for generating alternative solutions and finding answers rests with the members of the collaborative. There is no one else to blame.

Individuals of similar experiences, faced with similar problems in varying degrees, are most effective in helping each other. Peers and colleagues can assist each other through their sense of identification with one another. This identification provides support and motivation for growth.

The synergogic approach is a new learning mode that leads to symbiotic inclusivity. Educators are unaccustomed to the freedom, independence and autonomy that comes with the synergogic approach. This shift can encourage participants to share information and resources and to teach each other.

The question always arises with such models: What if the individuals are sharing misinformation and ignorance? How does new information, ideas or challenges to existing attitudes enter the system? This happens through the new type of leaders needed to move forward the collaborative. Leaders who view themselves as learners. Leaders who are committed to use synergogic processes and learning designs and change strategies such as the dialectic conversation. The emphasis is on autonomy and collegial affiliation.

Mouton and Blake (1984) suggest that synergogic learning has four major characteristics:

1. Learning administrators replace authority figures, authority figures are replaced with learning designs and instruments managed by a learning administrator. They use techniques and processes consistent with a synergogic approach.
2. The individuals involved in the collaborative become proactice participants who exercise responsibility for their own learning.
3. Through teamwork there are greater gains. The learning gain that results from teamwork exceeds the gain that could be made alone.
4. Learners' colleague affiliations provide motivation for learning.

This approach provides for initiative, motivation, opportunities for learning, growth, and strength for the journey that will be long and hard. The synergogic approach suggests that the adults in the collaborative will model the type of learning environment that they want for their students. The major strategy for creating this environment in the dialectic conversation. The dialectic conversation uses reasoning to solve problems and emphasizes database management.

THE DANGER—ARE WE THERE YET?

The coming together, the collaborative, empowers us and gives us strength. As teacher educators, we are empowered to share resources, resolve problems and generate the energy that will move us forward. The fundamental danger to attaining these goals is to continue to ask the question: Are we there yet? Within this question lies the greatest threat to regional collaboratives.

Too often we want to reach the destination without accounting for the trials and tribulations, the excitement of the trip, the amount of luggage we have to take, the time it takes, or the distance. It is also not realized that the most distant destination can be reached by going one mile at a time in the right direction, and not by racing around in circles, lamenting our plight and hitting stone walls.

> It may be that one of the many reasons many people have contributed to the utopian literature, and why millions today and in the distant past have been avid readers of these descriptions, is that it permits one to bypass the realities of the creation of new settings and societies. What these literary utopias have in common is that they were brought into existence by an act of controlled fantasy, and they avoid the evils of creation by a process analogous to the belief in virginal birth. (Sarason, 1993)

There is no definitive "there." Once you set your direction and you attain your mutually defined "there," be assured that new issues will bubble to the surface, or the environment in which you are operating will have changed, compelling you to move on to even higher levels.

This does not mean that we do not set specific targets, identify desired outcomes and benchmarks. It does not mean that we do not celebrate the rest stops along the way. However, we must recognize that they are rest stops. The process of multilevel change is continuous.

Multilevel change is simultaneously comprehensive and microscopic. Serving two masters requires us to navigate constantly between the vision and the reality, the road between A and B. The vision, the ideal, is the comprehensive view. What needs to happen next is the microscopic view. Once a vision is firmly and confidently in place, we are prepared to take advantage of the unexpected opportunities, the serendipity of life, to keep us moving toward our goals. We are able to say "no" to diversionary tactics.

What we do as educators is to confuse the vision with what needs to happen next. We are all students of the environment and have formed some opinion about what needs to be done to improve our educational system. We become impatient to get there. In our passion to get "there" we must not forget that the process, the way in which we move toward the vision or toward the common ideal, needs to be a core value. A focus on process will turn frustration into constructive energy, the attainment of our desired outcomes and ultimate liberation. Joint, collective action is the key.

While building a collaborative of sufficient magnitude, we must protect the need to look at the schools in our region, in our districts, in our neighborhoods as unique entities and decide what needs to be done on an individual-site basis. The focus has to be on the particular school, not the global notion of change or the global notion of our ideal. The ideal is like a standard, the beacon. It is the flag that we are following. The power comes from identifying the light, capturing it within multiple frames, and then sharing and spreading the light. The nature of that light is first self-identified and then commonly identified.

This is not to suggest that bringing schools, school systems, universities and colleges, parents and the business community together into regional collaboratives will automatically get the desired results. What will get the desired results is the luxury of focusing our limited energies and resources on the needs of students and the quality of teaching. What will guide us toward the desired outcome is loyalty to the problem-solving process. Until these things are done, major changes in education will remain an elusive fantasy with isolated, minuscule islands of excellence floating in a dead sea.

In order to focus our energies on things that matter, it is argued that we need a safe environment that critically engages the climate and contextual realities of education. Such an environment provides some secure boundaries for accepting criticism. It links disparate but interdependent parts of the enterprise, eliminates some of the distractions, mutes the discordant voices that tell us we don't know what we are doing. A safe learning environment for teachers gives them the freedom to use research and best practice to focus on what is important: student success, equal access and the quality of student-teacher interaction.

Accompanying the greatest danger to the regional collaboratives is our lack of confidence in ourselves as educators and our ability to resolve our own conflicts and solve our own problems. We need self confidence and forthright action. We are by nature caring and nurturing. Conflict is foreign to our being, yet conflict is a natural part of the growth processes of life. The divisions among us as educators are being used to sweep away our influence, our control of our destiny and the destiny of our students. Let us stop talking to ourselves (role alike groups) and talk to our constituents.

The reputation of teacher educators has to be rebuilt from the 1980s. We are no longer what we were. We need to assume our rightful place in society. We have a knowledge base. The importance of subject matter has been recognized as well as the need for supporting beginning teachers. The integration and demonstration of the connection between our ideals and reality is the current challenge.

Are we there yet? No, we are not there yet. But what we have done through the concept of regional collaboratives is embrace the power of human growth and potential, the need for working together and engaging in focused, joint problem-solving.

Making comprehensive change is difficult. It is wearing. It requires focus, quality leadership and sufficient confidence in the direction being taken. We cannot panic at the first sign of difficulty, abandoning any hope of growth or benefit from the lessons learned. Returning to the comfort of the status quo is not an option. The only option is making the trip. The journey is the thing, growing and learning together in new and better ways for achieving our mutual goals, creating a professional educational community.

Some may say to me that we have tried collaboratives and they don't work. I say to you, what did we learn from those experiences? What does it all mean? How can we use it to try again, to reach for a higher level?

THE PROMISE

If forceful, productive, regional collaboratives are to become operative and fulfill their mission, they must rest firmly on the principles of symbiotic inclusivity. These principles, when applied comprehensively and deeply, with courage and fortitude, result in cataclysmic effects.

Principle #1

Policy makers and legislators must become knowledgeable participants in the educative process.

Public perceptions of education create an invisible, but powerful, force that can enhance or restrict educational reform. This force has a life of its own and influences how decisions are made. This force must be turned to constructive purposes by the application of Principle #1. Legislators and policy makers must become a part of what we do. They must know the successes, the things that need improvement and what needs to be done. Schools and teacher education institutions exist within a socio-political context. Educators must move beyond rhetoric and debate to account for this reality.

Principle #2

Participants in the regional collaborative are drawn from the grassroots level.

Participation in the regional collaborative is by natural selection; those who are logical and willing to be involved. This willingness may be actively solicited to ensure balanced representation. Volition and representation are the key words. The only basis for participating in the collaborative is a burning desire to attain the desired outcomes: 1. academic success and equal educational access for all students, 2. a recognition that change must take place, and 3. an acceptance of the fact that professional isolation is no longer an option. All the stakeholders, as self-defined by the members of the collaborative, must have a seat at the table. These individuals may be teachers, teacher educators, administrators, union officials, parents, members of the business community, and students.

Principle #3

The agenda for the collaborative is naturalistic, genuine, data based and drawn from the participants.

The collaborative can serve as a network for team building across schools or districts and for networking around common problems—violence in the schools, breaking down the discipline barriers, nongraded classes, curriculum development. Within a given region there will be points of direct relationship which can serve as the focal point of reform—the education of teachers, college admission requirements, meeting the needs of the business community, the induction of new teachers (Seidel, 1994). Ideas such as these can be used as starting points. The agenda is framed in terms of a problem to be solved or a theme to be pursued. Problems are not viewed negatively. Once the problem has been objectively identified and validated, it is half-way solved.

Higher education institutions have a responsibility to work with and assist K–12 reform and to help address some of the major educational issues of the day. Otherwise, there is no rationale for their existence. New teachers need to recognize that they are becoming a part of a learning community. Conversely, a teacher education curriculum without benefit of the currency of what is happening daily in schools will be severely unresponsive to the needs of future teachers. K–12 educators are our partners in teacher education reform.

The collaborative can also deal with the issues not directly germane to higher education—the education of students who don't select to go on to higher education (Seidel, 1994). Within this educational framework there will be adult learning opportunities, after school programs, child care programs and the involvement of other agencies concerned with the welfare of children and young adults. This is a collaborative without walls.

Principle #4

Powerful personal and institutional change models must be demonstrated at all levels of the organization.

Powerful systems for delivery of the curriculum to prospective teachers and K–12 students need to be under constant review and development; systems that better approximate what we want students to know and be able to do. We have practiced for too long a "feedback" delivery system.

We have students in classes and hope that when the time comes they will be able to draw upon and apply what they have learned. What we need is a "feed forward" system. We need to create such a powerful need-to-know that the teacher candidate or the student is intrinsically motivated to seek out and design his or her own learning, based on real questions he or she has or problems he or she is facing.

Only action pays off—action within the broader community/political arena as well as action within the internal educational community. It is what you do that counts. If we as educators are not implementing the best practices and if we can not see the results of what we are doing in student performance, what we say is meaningless. We do not need another educational summit, high level policy conference or set of standards. We need a protective environment in which to decide jointly what needs to be done, do it, learn from it and modify it if it is not working to our satisfaction.

The public will not respect our opinion, nor accept it, if we are not involved in the process of growth in visible and dramatic ways. Assessment, evaluation accountability—formative and summative—are an essential part of all we do.

Although we are accountable for outcomes, the process is more important. The danger is focusing so hard on outcomes that we do not give enough thought to process. It is that middle ground—the listening to one another, the alignment of what we do, the small tasks accomplished each day, the repetitive things we do day after day—that will create the connections, professionalism and recognition we are seeking.

Principle #5

Leadership processes and liaisons must exist at all levels of the organization.

Kouzes and Posner (1987) postulate that leadership is a process not a place. They further suggest that what is important is "credibility of action," a leader's deeds are more important than his or her words. In their work, they discovered five practices that allowed leaders to get extraordinary things done within their organizations:

1. Challenge the process
2. Inspire a shared vision
3. Enable others to act
4. Model the way
5. Encourage the heart

This is only one model, but it suggests that the collaborative is going to require a new and different kind of leadership. A leadership that gets its power from building trust, a willingness to listen to everyone, helping others to do what they want to do, guiding the way through action and stimulating the passion in others, not by issuing mandates and directives. This type of leadership can exist at all levels. There can be teacher-leaders, parent-leaders, administrative-leaders. The more pervasive it is, the better.

EPILOGUE

As I was completing this book chapter, I happened to see the article "Ralph W. Tyler: A Remembrance" by Louis J. Rubin in the June 1994 issue of *Phi Delta Kappan*. The article was followed by an interview with Ralph Tyler by Diana Buell Hiatt seven months before his death. The fact that he could give such an astounding interview at the age of 92 is, in and of itself, remarkable.

This particular piece caught my eye because I had the good fortune to know Ralph Tyler through a mutual friend. I respected his intellect, his wit and his wisdom. Ralph Tyler was a part of every major educational movement for the past seventy years. A man who was the consummate teacher with boundless energy, whether in informal conversation or a formal lecture. He believed in testing the theoretical in the pragmatic world.

The interviewer asked him to reflect on life, education and learning. Based on the article and the interview, Ralph Tyler believed that:

1. The goal of schooling is "to develop problem-solving citizens who can actively engage in the work of a democratic society"
2. The purpose of education is to foster self-directing professionals; self-directed learners must have problem-solving skills in order to work with colleagues, parents, the community and children...
3. Learning occurs through reflection on direct experiences...
4. Educational problems are local not national. They should be addressed at the local level by the individuals who directly understand the problem.
5. I have never found a problem that could not be solved if everyone at hand worked on the solution together.
6. Social fragmentation is a challenge education can meet only through collective accomplishment

He could easily have been talking about the core values of a regional collaborative, a set of beliefs that guide the behavior of adults and students within the collaborative. A collaborative is a learning community that unifies the education profession and fosters the growth of all participants through problem solving, reflection and learning. Building on

Ralph Tyler's conclusions is a good place to be as we enter the next century.

REFERENCES

Berger Jr., Timothy K. (1992). "The Criticisms of Teacher Education: A Historical Perspective." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 19(2), 5–18.

Damerell, Reginald G. (1995). *Education's Smoking Gun*. New York: Freundlich Books.

Goodlad, John I. (1990). *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hiatt, Diana Buell, (June, 1994). "An Interview with Ralph Tyler: No Limit to the Possibilities." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(10), 786-789.

Koestenbaum, Peter. (1991). *Leadership: The Inner Side of Greatness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kouzes, James M. and Posner, Barry Z. (1987). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mouton, Jane Srygley and Blake, Robert R. (1984). *Synergogy: A New Strategy for Education, Training, and Development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rubin, Louis J. (June, 1994) "Ralph W. Tyler: A Remembrance." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(10), 784-789.

Sarason, Seymmour. (1993). *The Case for Change: Rethinking the Preparation of Educators*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schwartz, Henrietta S., ed. (1990). *Collaboration: Building Common Agendas*. Washington D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Seidel, Steve. (March/April 1994). "How to Change Our Schools in Just One day." *The Harvard Education Letter*, (X)2, 7.

chapter 6

Site-Based Management and Teacher Empowerment in Educational Reform: Can the Power Be Shifted?

Marilyn J. Haring
Purdue University

Whenever there is significant change in one of our country's institutions (in this case reform of K–12 education), it is important that a minority perspective be added to the discourse. People whose participation has been limited in overall numbers or has been limited to positions in the lower echelons quite naturally will have different questions and concerns about massive changes, based on their previous experiences. One overriding concern of those who have not had power as minority members is how they will participate in the power of the new institution. This is an especially interesting question in two central elements in current educational reform efforts—site-based management and teacher empowerment.

SBM and teacher empowerment arguably are new ways of doing the business of schools. Both emphasize the active participation of teachers; however, SBM is the broader approach or process (Midgley & Wood, 1993). With SBM, the role of teachers has been expanded beyond instruction to include school-wide decision-making and managing such diverse matters as personnel and budgets. These activities formerly were reserved for central administrators and school boards. With teacher empowerment, the instructional role of teachers has been redesigned (Smylie, 1994) to include teacher leadership in schools (e.g., mentoring new teachers, designing new curriculum, selecting textbooks). Thus, SBM represents a radical change in teacher responsibilities; but teacher empowerment also is significant in that teachers affect instruction not simply by teaching but also by providing leadership. Through empowerment, teachers may displace principals who, in the past, have been designated the instructional leaders of their schools.

Both SBM and teacher empowerment, then, necessitate a shift in power away from the traditional holders of administrative positions (Mentell, 1993). But women and minority educators, who are far more likely to be teachers than administrators, should be concerned about whether power actually can and will be shifted so they can play a key role in reform as agents of change (Heller, 1992). In addition, they may well question why, at this point in a sluggish reform movement, they have become central to reform solutions, why those administrators who have been reluctant to surrender power would do so now.

In this chapter, I will explore SBM and teacher empowerment, beginning with a brief account of the past dozen years in K–12 educational reform. Major focus will be on addressing the aspects of SBM and teacher empowerment that constitute reform and on discussing issues and concerns related to power for each of these reform entities.

PHASES OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

In 1983, citizens and educators alike were jarred by *A Nation at Risk*. This report's assertions of failure by the educational system spawned 50 or so other reform reports calling for dramatic efforts to fix schools. The frenzied reform activity that followed attempted first to impose educational excellence from the top (Midgley & Wood, 1993). Thus, there were carrots and sticks created by policymakers to increase achievement by teachers and students. To enhance teacher achievement, for example, there were career ladders, merit pay, the National Teacher's Examination, and new accreditation rigor for teacher education programs. To enhance student achievement, there appeared new graduation requirements, more testing, and national goals.

Had this top-down approach for reforming K–12 education proved to be successful, the hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of schools would have been strengthened and the traditional power structure affirmed. Successful reform, however, did not result from this approach. Instead, a second reform phase emerged, one in which restructuring schools through SBM and teacher empowerment was the goal of a bottom-up approach (Midgley & Wood, 1993). Although this second phase has given rise to speculation that there are many conflicting aspects of educational reform, it is this phase which gives many of us in education hope for meaningful change. Its success, however, will rest on numerous stakeholders sharing in the power that historically has been vested in select pockets of school organizations—central administration and school boards.

At the heart of the second phase of educational reform are SBM and teacher empowerment. They are bottom-up approaches in the sense that both rely on decentralization (e.g., Ferris, 1992; Newmann, 1993) to achieve reform through open and democratic processes in which those who must implement the decisions also make them (Hoyle, 1992). In addition, these approaches utilize, broadly, the expertise of teachers, who constitute the vast majority of K–12 educational professionals but who occupy the bottom echelon of school organizations.

In the two sections that follow, first SBM and then teacher empowerment will be explored in greater depth, with particular attention being given at the end of each section to issues of power and control.

SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

Site-based management also is called school-based management in the extensive literature on educational reform. Both terms, however, reflect the fact that SBM is an attempt to change the locus of decision-making from district to school. This is an important change because it permits teachers, who reside professionally in schools, to be a part of decision-making. Also important is the accompanying emphasis on decentralization when the locus of decision-making is shifted to schools. Such decentralization may be seen as a rejection of cultural biases suggested by Sacken (1994) toward managerial authority, salvation by leaders, and surrender to administrators of responsibility for the most tedious and unpleasant tasks. These cultural biases are strongly associated with the traditional ways schools have been organized and staffed and with the pressing need for educational reform!

Several key components and activities distinguish SBM. Among them, a local school council often is established on which teachers, parents, administrators, and community members serve (Newmann, 1993). These councils conduct their business through participatory decision-making; some even operate on a consensus model. Although responsibilities and authority vary, typically the councils do several of the following: Clarify policies on such matters as discipline, plan and implement staff development, address personnel issues, develop budgets and oversee fiscal matters, develop policy on enrichment of programs and curricula, adopt textbooks, and propose new programs. Many of these responsibilities represent a shift of governance and management away from district school boards and central administrators.

SBM, then, is a highly democratic process designed to reform school governance in terms of policy and management. Unfortunately, two of its weaknesses are related to a preoccupation with process (Smylie, 1994). First, as can happen with young democracies, the representatives to school councils often are conflicted over simply reflecting the wishes of the majority of people they represent or being empowered representatives who consult but then make wise (and independent) decisions. At issue here is accountability and its ability to absorb the energy and attention of those determined to act in democratic ways, often in reaction to the hierarchical school structures of the past that were not accountable. Second, a result of focus on the process itself and on little else can be a failure to examine issues in depth. Thus, having a democratic process as a key component of SBM is critical, but it does not ensure strong reform outcomes.

Overall, educational reform—including the restructuring of schools that occurs through the process of SBM—seeks to increase student achievement (Smylie, 1994). As straight forward as this overarching goal may seem, often it is obscured by focus on elements that are assumed to contribute to that goal but may not do so directly. These elements may be wider input into budgetary matters or teacher empowerment to participate in personnel decisions, or a host of other changes in management practices and policies of the past. Although there is much to recommend them, such elements do not automatically result in innovation in classrooms, increased instructional effectiveness, and greater student achievement. Therefore, some have urged that SBM be clearly goal-oriented and that those goals relate to student achievement.

Among those urging a goal orientation for SBM are Midgley and Wood (1993), who assert the need for a change in the culture of schools that would result in a task focus rather than ability focus. By emphasizing mastery, schools would engage students in more interesting and supportive ways that would result in higher individual and collective achievement. Another goal for SBM was advocated by Goldman, Dunlap, and Conley (1993), who studied 16 schools and found that developing nonstandardized, site-specific restructuring programs was most useful in supporting student achievement. That is, there was no common goal that universally served the purpose of increasing achievement; every site needed to use SBM to explore and determine its own best path.

Given the ambiguity concerning goals for SBM, one might ask, "so how is SBM doing in practice?" Some have found encouraging results. Antelo and Ovando (1993), Lange (1993), and White (1992), for example, reported that SBM reduced levels of uncertainty for teachers. Presumably, uncertainty could interfere with instructional effectiveness. In addition, Goldman, Dunlap and Conley (1993) found in their research that schools changed when administrators and teachers had developed good working relationships and were ready for change. Thus, successful change to SBM is possible in some circumstances.

Others, however, have reacted with skepticism to the overall impact of SBM. Among these, Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) reviewed extant literature on SBM and concluded that it is "everywhere and nowhere," i.e., the flight to SBM has not impacted much because little of real importance has been decentralized. This view was shared by Smylie (1994) in his extensive literature review. He concluded that there have been mainly minor variations in existing programs and practices due to SBM. Interestingly, both Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) and Smylie (1994) suggested more influence for SBM by joining governance reform with content (curriculum and instruction) reform.

The question of SBM impact raises issues about power and control that have not been resolved. For example, if decentralization has not been achieved, then transfer of power from central administrators and school boards must not have occurred. More likely, the transfer of some power has occurred; but it is mainly the power which those who have had it are willing to relinquish. Thus, if superintendents and boards are still constructing the agenda then teachers, principals, and local school councils remain consultants, albeit more active ones that in the past.

There are numerous compelling reasons for power remaining centralized, even with sincere commitment to move to SBM. Among those reasons is the widely cited fact that teachers have not been prepared systematically to assume new authority in areas beyond their expertise in curriculum and instruction. As learners about fiscal and personnel matters and school policy, their first absorbing task is to achieve competence. This is more easily done by adhering to firmly established practices in their schools, practices which were devised by administrators and boards, rather than inventing new ways in which teachers would have a greater share of power.

Competence also can be achieved through training; but it is often training done by the present experts—administrators. Among Hoyle's (1992) 10 commandments to principals for facilitating successful SBM at their schools was an admonition to train teachers in the art of decision-making and consensus-building. Although well intentioned, this commandment is an example of how power can be retained rather than transferred. That is, those who provide the training have substantial control over the agenda.

Another reason power has remained more centralized than SBM warrants is that administrators who have survived in today's schools and districts undoubtedly are knowledgeable about issues of control and power and are skilled in their use. Hoy and Brown (1988), for example, suggested that a major task of leaders is to exact compliance for their directives. This view is consistent with empirical evidence found by Blase (1993) that open and effective principals utilized a leadership model in which control of teachers was a central goal. Further, Blase (1993) suggested that principals may have a need to dominate; and they exist in a bureaucratic milieu that encourages domination by providing a power structure for them to use.

Finally, with regard to shifting power to fully utilize the potential of SBM, there is some evidence that due to their own views of power, teachers may be satisfied with being better informed and more involved. In intensive interviews with teachers at three decentralized school districts, White (1992) found that more than 90% of the teachers felt they had significant input into budgeting, staffing, and curriculum matters. It is noteworthy that they did not report controlling those matters, rather, having significant input. In addition, findings by Antelo and Ovando (1993) that SBM reduced teachers' uncertainty suggest that their needs may be more for the security associated with certainty than for power and absolute control. Perhaps many of those who selected teaching (rather than administration or some other profession) are not as oriented to power as they are to instruction and collaboration.

TEACHER EMPOWERMENT

Teacher empowerment, also called teacher leadership, has been the subject of considerable attention in the literature on educational reform. It received perhaps its biggest boost from the 1986 report of the Carnegie Task Force in Teaching as a Profession, *A Nation Prepared*. In that report, a key concept was a new profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools. Thus, teacher empowerment is central to what Smylie (1994) termed the redesign of teacher's work and to the new roles and responsibilities for teachers that have emerged at many sites around the country (Eisner, 1992). Teacher empowerment, however, is most concerned with teachers assuming new *instructional* roles, compared to SBM where new teacher roles extend beyond instruction to management and policymaking on a variety of topics related to schooling.

Newmann (1993) suggested that new instructional roles include the following: instructional coach, curriculum team member, facilitator of new programs, and student advisor. In addition, many empowered teachers are serving also as lead teachers, master teachers, curriculum coordinators, and designated mentors to first-year teachers (Smylie, 1994). Assumption of these new roles has given the teachers who are involved more authority, control, autonomy, task variety, collegiality, and opportunities for growth, but not necessarily more pay, power, or time to enhance their own classroom instruction! Instead, their reward most often has been satisfaction, stimulation, and increased motivation and commitment. A persistent question for teacher empowerment, as with SBM, has been, "Toward what end?" That is, a direct connection between teacher empowerment and student achievement has yet to be firmly established. Nay-sayers have been quick to point out that most of the roles, although new to teachers, have existed previously in schools but were assigned to administrators (especially to principals, who have been the curriculum leaders). Hence, skeptics call for evidence that empowered teachers will be more effective than principals, especially in terms of enhancing student learning. Intuitively, such enhancement by teachers seems possible or even likely; but not enough empirical evidence exists to declare teacher empowerment an unmitigated success. There are some encouraging signs, however, as discussed in the following paragraphs.

Teacher empowerment is part of a commitment and approach to educational change in which emphasis is placed on developing innovative working relationships instead of relying on legislation (Rowan, 1990). Such working relationships are central to two concepts advanced in the recent literature on reform. The first is professional communities (Little & McLaughlin, 1993), in which teachers' work continues to be focused on student learning but with more coordination and interdependence. This would create a new collective autonomy for teachers to discuss student learning and associated problems in order to enhance student achievement. In professional communities, teacher empowerment would take the form of elevating collective concern and action related to learning above interference from an administrative hierarchy.

Innovative working relationships also are the core of Newmann's (1993) concept of collaborative organization, which can be utilized both within schools and across schools and other organizations. Within schools, organizing teams of teachers and students into families or groups, utilizing case management strategies to coordinate services for students, and using quality circles all can enhance learning. When organizations are linked to schools through collaboration, partnerships are created, often with universities or other broader community agencies. Newmann (1993) described collaborative organization as one of the most powerful pillars of restructuring theory, but he acknowledged that effects on the content agenda of schooling still remain questionable.

An important additional indicator of the success of teacher empowerment is how well new roles and related authority have been received by teachers. Troen and Boles (1993) were among the skeptics, citing their conviction that teachers often are reluctant to think of themselves as leaders. Further, Rosenholtz (1989) suggested that teachers generally value professional independence, individuality, privacy, and status equality—all of which work against teacher empowerment. That is, the new instructional roles assumed by some teachers place them in more public and collaborative positions that enhance regular teacher status. The notion that teachers value autonomy also was supported by Deci, Vallerand, Pelletier, and Ryan (1991), who concluded that motivation would suffer if autonomy were reduced (as would happen with teacher enpowerment).

White (1992) provided some balance to the pessimistic view just presented concerning the incompatibility of teacher empowerment and teacher needs. Her interviews of teachers who had been empowered for at least 5 years revealed that only 5% wanted less input than they presently had in school matters, including instruction. Thus, there is reason to believe that at least some teachers respond quite favorably to the new roles made possible through teacher empowerment.

Equally important, however, are the views of principals on teacher empowerment because principals are key agents who can facilitate or discourage changes in teachers' roles. Of additional importance is the fact that as teachers' roles have changed, corresponding changes have occurred in principals' roles. Following, then, is an examination of selected recent literature on the redesign of principals' roles due to teacher empowerment.

Moderate views of principals' participation in teacher empowerment were taken by Heller (1992) and Mentell (1993), in which both assumed few changes for teachers and principals. Heller (1992) acknowledged that teachers must be agents of change but asserted that empowerment is related to treatment of teachers, not to teachers governing others. Thus, he urged his principal colleagues to treat teachers as professionals and thus empower them. He also suggested that dignity is what teachers covet. Similarly, Mentell (1993) called for additional training for principals in group processes and in facilitating decision-making in order for them to interact effectively with empowered teachers. The realignment of power he envisioned was not between principal and teachers but between central office administrators and teachers.

Less moderate views were offered by Troen and Boles (1993) and Sacken (1994) in which they promulgated drastic changes in school leadership. Troen and Boles (1993) suggested redefining the role of principal from instructional leader to developing a community of leaders (i.e., teachers). Further, they advocated evaluating principals on their ability to foster teacher leadership and their record of rewarding teachers who demonstrated leadership on specific reform tasks. Even more severe, though, was the stance of Sacken (1994), who proclaimed, "No More Principals!" Basing his provocative article on the belief that professional/career administrators distort dialogue and decisions with their managerial ethic, Sacken (1994) urged that no educator at the building level ever be permanently removed from the classroom in order to carry out administrative duties. His solution was to handle administration similar to jury duty in which each person is expected to serve at some time.

Based on the preceding discussion of teacher empowerment, it is not surprising that there are power issues embedded not only in redesign of teacher and principal roles but also in change of status for teachers who assume new roles.

With regard to redesign of roles that affects both teachers and principals, Troen and Boles (1993) speculated that central administrators were largely responsible for designing those changes and inevitably there would be lack of vision and limited scope for teacher leadership. Thus, little power would be shifted to teachers. This may well be the case, also, when principals are the architects of the altered roles. Although some principals naturally will relish the new role of facilitator, according to Clark and Astuto (1993) few have been prepared for this aspect of leadership. In fact, Clark and Astuto (1993) indicted administrative preparation programs by saying, "Graduate training for educational leaders is one of the few areas in education that has remained impervious to reform" (p. 518).

In addition to the power issues just cited, the change in status accorded some teachers when they assume instructional leadership also generates concerns about power. Teachers generally have enjoyed equal status in the past, but now it is possible for some to achieve insider status by acting as lead teachers, curriculum coordinators, mentor teachers, or a variety of other leadership positions. Certainly, in some states, this change of status has become a concern of teachers' unions, with the result that rules have been invoked that are designed to maintain equal status even when some teachers assume new roles. A prime example of such activity is the selection of mentor teachers according to seniority and not by competence. To the extent that there are strong forces directed toward maintaining equal status (and power), it will be difficult for teachers to offer leadership that will redesign schools for the future.

CONCLUSIONS

It is obvious that in both SBM and teacher empowerment, shifting power from central administration and school boards is exceedingly complex. Part of the complexity derives from the reluctance of some to relinquish power, and part of the complexity is related to the reluctance of some teachers to assume power. Further complicating matters is the fact that there is no compelling evidence that shifting the power through SBM and teacher empowerment will result in strengthened student outcomes.

Some important questions about shifting power, then, remain from this exploration of SBM and teacher empowerment. First, how will the education minorities (i.e., teachers) participate in the power of an educational system that has been impacted somewhat by the reform movement? My prediction is that teachers largely will eschew power in favor of more collaboration and cooperation which ultimately will benefit students. They will do this partly because they do not seek power but instead seek to facilitate their students' learning. They also will be forced into this position by those who are unwilling to relinquish any more power than is necessary in order to claim reform efficacy.

A second unanswered question is, why are teachers now central to reform solutions? Possibly there is a reluctant admission of failure by those who tried the top-down approach in the first phase of educational reform. Or, possibly, there is recognition that reform must be led by those who are closest to the desired outcome of enhanced student learning, despite the fact that they are not the possessors of organizational power and probably never will be. The most important unanswered question of all, however, may be that posed by Vaclav Havel (cited in Glickman, 1992): "Can a countermovement now succeed as a dominant movement?" All of us who are invested in site-based management and teacher empowerment as crucial to educational reform must hope that the answer is a resounding, "Yes!"

REFERENCES

Antelo, A., & Ovando, M. N. (1993). Levels of environmental uncertainty of a site—based management school within a minority/majority context. *Journal of School Leadership, 3*, 136–151.

Blase, J. (1993). The micropolitics of effective school-based leadership: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*, 142–161.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (1988). *A Nation Prepared*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, D. L., & Astuto, T. A. (1994). Redirecting reform: Challenges to popular assumptions about teachers and students. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*, 512–520.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26*, 325–346.

Eisner, E. W. (1992). Educational reform and the ecology of schooling. *Teachers College Record, 93,* 610–627.

Ferris, J. M. (1992). School-based decision making: A principal-agent perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14,* 333–346.

Glickman, C. D. (1992). The essence of school renewal: The prose has begun. *Educational Leadership, 50,* 24–27.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1993). Facilitative power and nonstandardized solutions to school site restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29,* 69–92.

Heller, G. S. (1992). Teacher empowerment—sharing the challenge: A guide to implementation and success. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 77,* 94–103.

Hoy, W. K., & Brown, B. L. (1988). Leadership behavior of principals and the zone of acceptance of elementary teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration, 26,* 22–38.

Hoyle, J. R. (1992). Ten commandments for successful site-based management. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 76,* 81–87.

Lange, J. T. (1993). Site-based, shared decision making: A resource for restructuring. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 76,* 98–107.

Little, J. W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1993). *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mentell, E. J. (1993). Implementing site-based management: Overcoming the obstacles. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 77,* 97–102.

Midgley, C., & Wood, S. (1993). Beyond site-based management: Empowering teachers to reform schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75,* 245–252.

Newmann, F. M. (1993). Beyond common sense in educational restructuring. *Educational Researcher, 22*(2), 4–11, 22.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools.* New York: Longman.

Rowan, B. (1990). Commitment and control: Alternative strategies for the organizational design of schools. In C. B. Cazden (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 16, pp. 353–389). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sacken, D. (1994). No more principals! *Phi Delta Kappan, 75,* 664–670.

Smylie, M. A. (1994). Redesigning teachers' work: Connections to the classroom. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Review of research in education 20,* (pp. 129–177). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The imperative of Education reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Troen, V., & Boles, K. (1993, November 3). Teacher leadership: How to make it more than a catch phrase. *Education Week,* pp. 27, 29.

White, P. A. (1992). Teacher empowerment under "ideal" school-site autonomy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14,* 69–82.

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. (1992). Rethinking school-based management policy and research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*, 529–549.

chapter 7

Academics and Cultural Excellence for African American Students: Imperatives for Public Education

Hugh J. Scott
Hunter College of CUNY

THE PROBLEM

Being Black in America has meant not only being racially and culturally different but also being treated by most White Americans as racially and culturally inferior. America's egalitarian consciousness has always flown south for the winter when it was time to deal with the rights, contributions, aspirations, and needs of African Americans (N. Harris, 1990). For centuries, the U.S. Constitution's references to justice, welfare, and liberty were mocked by the treatment meted out daily to African Americans by all three branches of our government (Higginbotham, 1978). African Americans in the American democracy have been subjected to laws, regulations, policies, and beliefs which proclaimed their alleged inferiority to White Americans. The comprehensive and systematic racial discrimination—250 years of slavery and more than 100 years of racial discrimination after slavery—denied African Americans equal protection under the law and created the economic, political, and educational disadvantages that continue to impair the life-chances of African Americans.

The use of race theory to give legitimacy to the establishment of a socioeconomic pattern of racial segregation and discrimination against African Americans provided the ideological camouflage to support claims of differences between Whites and Blacks in intellectual, physical, and emotional capabilities (Ballard, 1973). Frederick Douglass (1963), ex-slave and the father of the civil rights movement, noted that slaveholders believed that it was necessary to make certain that slaves were "trained from the cradle up to think and feel that their masters are superior and invested with a sort of sacredness." Race theory posited that there was a connection between blackness and evil and that there was anthropolometric and biological evidence to indicate that African Americans were incapable of learning, and therefore, had to be protected from their natural immorality (Ballard, 1973).

Racism is a belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capabilities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race. Racism feeds on scientifically false ideas and is also derived from scientifically sound ideas which have been distorted or taken out of context. Race itself has no validity as a meaningful biological or genetic concept, but race and ethnicity in America are social facts that significantly affect people's life-chances and their relations with members of other groups (Light, Keller, & Calhoun, 1989). Racism, in theory and practice, is an evil ideology used to exploit and subordinate people of color (Pine & Hilliard, 1990). Racism in America asserts that the inequality of African Americans is absolute and unconditional and that independent of any differences in color, intellect, and accomplishment, African Americans are to be relegated to an inferior status within the American society.

Almost a century ago, W.E.B. Du Bois (1965), teacher, author, scholar, poet, and Pan-Africanist, declared that African Americans participated imperfectly in the American society. Du Bois asserted that this imperfection was due to the "color line" in America. The "color line" enforced racist laws, policies, practices which relegated African Americans to second-class citizenship. White Americans deprived Black Americans, as a group, of equal treatment and then blamed them for their disadvantaged condition in America, leading to further elaboration of racist theory. Race in America is not simply a function of physical appearances but also of explicit and implied power relations, with African Americans finding themselves divorced from the levers of power and authority within the socio-economic order (Pine & Hilliard, 1990). Racism, old and new, operates to impose limits on the opportunities and benefits of the American democracy that African Americans are allowed to share (Clark, 1980).

For most White Americans racism means active bigotry and discrimination, a charge from which they readily acquit themselves. While many White Americans agree that racism exists in America, they are reluctant or unwilling to identify or label the carriers of this long-standing social disease. They reject the contention that the heritage of slave laws continues to impair the life chances of millions of Black Americans (Higginbotham, 1978). Millions of White Americans view racism as the sin of their forbearers and not a current pervasive social disease. But race and racism cannot be relegated to America's social problems morgue. The three greatest contradictions in the American democracy are racism, sexism, and classism. With the possible exception of sexism, there is no cause to believe that any of these three areas has declined in significance (Kearse, 1980). Racism is so entrenched in America that it perpetuates itself. Racist beliefs about African Americans have become so widespread, so unconscious, and so traditional among the majority of White Americans that racism may be regarded as an independent cause of prejudice and discrimination against African Americans.

Racism describes the combination of individual prejudice and individual discrimination, on the one hand, and institutional policies and practices, on the other hand, that result in the unjustified negative treatment of members of a racial and ethnic group (Visiting Committee, 1986). Overt racism is the most easily identifiable form of racism; it is based on the notion that some races are inherently superior to others (Reyes & Halcon, 1988). Covert racism, in contrast, stems from a more subtle philosophy, at times taking the form of superior virtue, believed common only to virtuous races (Reyes & Halcon, 1988). Racism is both overt and covert: individual Whites acting against individual Blacks and acts against Blacks by institutions and communities controlled by Whites (Carmichael & Hamilton, 1967).

The legal desegregation of the races in America has contributed to the popular illusion in White America that the basis of racial discrimination and conflict no longer exists (Marable, 1992). But the social disease of racism is more complex than either the conscious conspiracy of a power elite or the simple delusion of a few ignorant bigots; it is a part of the common historical experience in America (Marable, 1981). Racism in America would not vanish if White Americans stopped believing in the false claims about African Americans. Persuading White Americans of the truth about the races is the least difficult challenge in the fight against racism. The hard part is to persuade White Americans not to be unfairly partial to members of their own race (Boxill, 1992–1993). The Black experience in America clearly reveals that the ethnocentrism of dominant White groups in America has meant that the invitation to participate equally in the American society has not been offered to certain racial and ethnic groups. African Americans, angered and frustrated by the "increasingly empty repetition of tarnished ideals" in their quest for equality in America, asked the question: "Is White America irredeemably racist?" (Bell, 1987).

Former U.S. Federal Judge, A. Leon Higginbotham, was correct: "The poisonous legacy of legalized oppression based upon the matter of color can never be adequately purged from our society if we act as if slave laws never existed." (Higginbotham, 1978). For generations, African Americans have been beset by the interlocking problems of race and poverty. Actions by the U.S. Supreme Court and the U.S. Congress have not brought an end to the cycle of despair for millions of African Americans—no jobs, bad housing, and worse education. As the 20th Century plays out its last decade, African Americans across the socioeconomic spectrum are beginning to address some fundamental concerns about the linkage between racism and capitalism: "Is the free market of the capitalist economic system in America free for Whites only, particularly those who control the ascending ladder of command post in the class hierarchies of entrepreneurial advantage?" (Cruse, 1987). Are the constancy of the poverty and inequality status of African Americans over the past twenty years the consequence of systematic factors built into an economy that perpetuates Black disadvantage? (Swinton, 1991).

THE CHALLENGE

Black civil rights leaders since the Civil War have been in general agreement with the statement made by Frederick Douglass in the 1860s: "Neither we, nor any other people will ever be respected till we respect ourselves, and we will never respect ourselves till we have the means to live respectably..." Equality for African Americans means being received as recognized and respected citizens of the American democracy. The common foe of all Black protests has been racism, and there can be no compromise with racial discrimination in America. The words of the National Negro Committee in 1910 are as relevant for African Americans today as they were in 1910: "Any discrimination based simply on race or color is barbarious, we care not how hallowed it be by custom, expediency, or prejudice" (National Negro Committee on Mr. Washington, 1910). For almost 400 years in America, the highest priority for African Americans has been resistance to oppression in their quest for self-determination—the need for African Americans to participate in a meaningful way in the decisions affecting their lives and the lives of their children (Franklin, 1992). Every generation of African Americans was left a legacy of resolve to overcome racial discrimination. It has been the self-determination efforts of millions of Black Americans in each and every generation that have been the major driving force of Black progress toward self-determination in America, not the moral conscience of the majority of White Americans.

Du Bois (1965) noted that given the hostile social and political environment for African Americans, they had three possible responses to the predicament of racism: "a feeling of revolt and revenge; an attempt to adjust all thought and action to the will of the greater group; or finally, a determined effort at self-realization and self-development despite the environing opinion." Alexander Crummell, clergyman, missionary, teacher, and scholar, was born in 1819, about a half century before W.E.B. Du Bois. Crummell is identified by some Black scholars as the first African American to be prominent in putting scholarship to the service of the Black protest. He emphasized that African Americans had a moral obligation to develop what is distinctive and commendable in their culture and to promote their cultural worth (Crummell, 1969). Crummell believed that African Americans had an unconditional ethical allegiance to their racial/cultural solidarity and that this fidelity to one's racial/cultural group should be manifested in the establishment of African American art, science, philosophy, and scholarship, as well as Black manufacturers, business enterprises and symbols of power (Kirkland, 1993).

Vincent Harding (1973) editor of the *Black Scholar*, asserted that in the quest for self-determination, African Americans must not ignore the reality that the acquisition of knowledge and the affirmation of self are the beginnings of the long battle against the systems that have created the domination of African Americans. Carter G. Woodson (1977) in the *Miseducation of the Negro*, first published in 1933, issued the following condemnation of public education in America:

> The same educational process which inspires and stimulates the oppressor with the thought that he is everything and has accomplished everything worthwhile, depresses and crushes at the same time the spark of genius in the Negro by making him feel that his race does not amount to much and never will measure up to standards of other peoples. The Negro, thus educated, is a hopeless liability to the race.

Manning Marable (1991), in *Race, Reform, and Rebellion*, reminded African Americans that oppressed people who abandon the knowledge of their own protest or fail to analyze its lessons, perpetuate their dominance by others. The educational system is the single social institution in our society that has the major responsibility for dispensing or promulgating those values that identify a group's consciousness of itself (Black Caucus Statement, 1968). If African Americans are ever to bridge the gap between aspiration and actuality in America, they must succeed in restructuring their role in the management of those institutions which control their social, political, economic and educational status. The defenders and beneficiaries of racism in America know that public education is now the stage where non-Whites are waging a formidable confrontation with those who desire to continue to use public education as an instrument to perpetuate the American democracy's most crippling social diseases: sexism, classism, and racism.

In 1984, The Task Force on Black Academic and Cultural Excellence of the National Alliance of Black School Educators (NABSE) issued its report entitled: *Saving the African American Child.* In the report, the task force declared that the reform and renewal of public education for African Americans must include the reclamation of Black history and culture as an integral part of the education of African American students. The Task Force proclaimed that a Black consciousness should permeate all aspects of the education of African American students and that the education of African American students must be more integrally linked to the struggle of Black people for survival and self-determination in a racist society.

It appears that African Americans are engaged in a seemingly never ending struggle to avert their subjugation as a race, but the descendants of African slaves have historically resisted oppression and efforts to eradicate their history and cultural roots. For African Americans, access to knowledge of their history and culture and the appropriate inclusion of the contributions of Africans and African Americans in the mainstream of curricula in schools, colleges, and universities are not "pleasant luxuries" but the very "marrow" of survival for African Americans in a racist society. Du Bois (1965) was correct: It is the duty of African Americans to resist oppression and that resistance is tantamount to cultural self-determination. African American students should be provided an education that is contributive to their intellectual and political emancipation in America (Ray, 1979).

The words of Carter G. Woodson (1933), unfortunately, are as relevant today as they were several generations ago: It may be of no importance to Black Americans for them to be able to boast of more educated members than they had in 1865, if they are the wrong kind. John Henrik Clarke (1972), the brilliant Black scholar and historian, asserts that an understanding of African American history and culture tells Black students where they have been, where they still must go, and what they still must be. How African Americans view the present is, in part, a consequence of their understanding of the past; their view of history provides the background against which African Americans understand or fail to understand what transpires day to day in their personal lives and in society as a whole (Howard, 1990). Black students have their roots in an African American culture. As African Americans, Black students need to gain a knowledge of and a pride in their own history and culture so that they can go on to discover that at the core of every distinct culture are the common imperatives of humankind (Davis, as cited in Hentoff, 1966). The ideal of Black consciousness suggests that African

Americans must become keenly aware of their common history, their common heritage, and their common predicament as Black people in America. African American students must be educated to recognize and understand their culture from the inside out, rather than from the outside in. African Americans must be placed squarely on the stage of human drama (R. Harris, 1991). In the overall effort to improve the life chances and the educational lot of Black students, the reclamation and restoration of African American history and culture must be priorities that are equal in importance to all others (Task Force, 1984).

Now, more so than ever before, Black scholars and educators are about the serious business of ending the practice in public education of teaching African American students about the contributions of White Americans while observing only minimally and often derisively the contributions of Black Americans in every field of endeavor. African Americans, who may be moderates, militants, or extremists in their civil rights activities, hold in common the belief that Black Americans must take steps to ensure that those who created and supported racially segregated public education in America are prohibited from allowing the same educational neglect to occur in the post *Brown* era of public education. Although there is a tendency within schools, colleges, and universities in America to presume that racism is the product of other institutions, racism remains a part of the fabric of public education in America. Bigotry, prejudice, and discrimination based on the ideology of racism remain powerful parts of the psyche and response of public education in America. Educational institutions must deal with racism within their student bodies, within their own personnel, and within many of the presumptions that drive the curriculum and shape the allocation of resources (Visiting Committee, 1986).

Racism exists in educational institutions in the form of unexamined values that deny status and dignity to people of color. Racism exists in testing and grouping practices which lead to the mislabeling, the misclassification, and the miseducation of millions of Black students. Racism operates in public education when Black students, on the average, receive educational programs and offerings which differ in kind and content from those for White students, with the differences significantly influencing educational achievement and later educational and career options (College Entrance Examination Board, 1985).

IMPERATIVES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

Most African American students enter public education with the deck stacked against them. They are forced by society into socioeconomic environments that fall far short of meeting minimal standards of decency, humaneness, and justice. While racism disregards socioeconomic status in its response to African Americans, it impacts most severely on the Black underclass. Black family income is about half that for White families, and nine million African Americans live in poverty (Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). About half of all Black children 18 years or under live in households below the poverty level, and most Black children do not live in two parent households (College Entrance Examination Board, 1985). African Americans have high unemployment rates, low rates of employment, inferior occupational distribution, and low wages and earnings (Swinton, 1991). For the millions of African Americans whose lives are circumscribed by disease, desperation, and illiteracy, the ownership of capital, material resources, educational accomplishment, and access to power will continue to be beyond their reach (Marable, 1991).

Education is a form of social policy—a means by which society distributes power and privilege. Educational institutions reflect the values of society by the way in which they are organized and operated and by the ways in which the various ethnic, religious, and racial groups are treated. Theoretically, the public school is an institution in which society pools its funds in an effort to provide benefits for all. But African Americans in both society and the schools are doubly disadvantaged by both race and low income (Brookover, 1985). Education in the American democracy has always been an important means through which the individual can improve his or her socioeconomic status. Schools have become the major social institution, not only for preparing individuals, but also for their selection and placement in various positions within society. The level of entrance into the occupational world is strongly predetermined by the level that is achieved in the educational world. Yet, large numbers of African American students will either drop out of school—deficient in basic skills, marginally literate, and basically unemployable—or will remain in school and experience 12 or 13 years of inconsequential public education. The ways in which public schools assess intelligence and ability, group and track students for instruction, fragment and trivialize curriculum and instruction, and organize and manage schools, create barriers that prevent many African American students from obtaining full advantage from schooling (Keating & Oakes, 1988).

The miseducation of African American students not only emasculates them from society, but also guarantees that social decision-making is kept in the hands of White Americans who will use such power to preserve the advantages enjoyed only by the decision-making elite. Many educators in schools for African American students do not truly believe that no racial group has monopoly on intelligence or any other positive characteristic of human behavior. The learning capacity or educability of African American students depends far more on what kind of school they attend than on the race or ethnicity of the family from which they come (Edmonds, 1979). Educational strategies are derived from the pervasive social beliefs and primary educational assumptions of those who exercise power in the determination of the permissible policies and practices in mainly Black schools. The creation of more effective schools for African American students will require fundamental changes in how schools evaluate, sort, label, and process Black students (Pink, 1984). When educators truly believe in the ability of Black students to learn in spite of the exigencies of racism and poverty, they form high expectations and develop effective educational programs and practices (Sizemore, 1985).

For those educators and decision-makers who believe that Black parents and their children are deserving of respect, goodwill, and equality and that Black students are entitled to public schools that are functional, safe, healthful, and beautiful, several imperatives for public education are offered that hold promise for improving the life chances and educational lot of African American students. The imperatives are presented with capsule commentary.

> IMPERATIVE: *In the overall effort to improve the life chances and the educational lot of African Americans, the reclamation of African American history, and the recognition of and respect for the rich culture of African Americans, must be priorities that are equal in importance to all others.*

African Americans have been exposed to laws, regulations, policies, and beliefs which proclaimed their alleged inferiority to White Americans. When a system of racial discrimination is rooted in a complex network of degrading and dehumanizing fictions about its victims, it can be devastating to self-respect and self-esteem (Moody-Adams, 1992–1993). Public education has delivered the message to most African Americans that the history and achievements of African Americans are not integral to the real learning that goes on in the schools: Real knowledge is presented as the domain of White Americans (Reyes & Halcon, 1990). Thus, most African Americans are both misinformed and uninformed about their ancestors and their ancestral roots in Africa. Also, most African Americans are abysmally ignorant about the role of Blacks in America. The fact that most African Americans have a poor sense of their past does not mean that they do not have a past (Kirkland, 1993).

There is an African American culture in America, and this culture is unique, rich, and distinctive. Culture consists of the behavioral patterns, symbols, values, and other human-made components of society and is the unique achievement of a human group which distinguishes it from other groups (Banks, 1971). Culture includes the basic conditions of the existence of a people, their behaviors, style of life, values, preferences, and creative expressions that emanate from work and play (Billingsley, 1974). African American culture is a synthesis of African culture and American European culture as they interacted under slavery. There are aspects of American European culture that African Americans subscribe to and have incorporated into their communities, but there are also distinctive characteristics in major aspects of Black life that set them apart (Young, 1972). While enslaved Blacks from Western, Central, and Southern Africa in the 17th and 18th centuries were diverse in experiences, language, cultural practices, and many other aspects, it was their common experience as slaves in America that served as the foundation for the "cultural value system" that was handed down from the Africans to their American-born offspring, the African Americans (Franklin, 1992). Because more than one generation of African Americans was victimized by enslavement in America, certain values remained relevant from one generation to the next and became the "core values" of the African American experience. African Americans cannot be ignorant of or lack respect for their own unique history and culture and be able to meet others in the nation and the world on equal footing.

> IMPERATIVE: *It is not the role of public education to function as a "melting pot" for the purpose of seeking cultural sameness; public education should rethink and revise the intellectually generalized homogeneity of the "Western narrative" and the traditions of the United States of America through the formal study of themes regarding race, gender, and non-Western culture.*

The roots of this nation are in the Western historical tradition; this reality requires that students have some intellectual familiarity with, but not necessarily adherence to, the philosophies of the Greeks and those of the European tradition (Banziger, 1991). Despite improvements, the curricula in schools tend to define excellence in terms of a return to the "classics" and a presumption of Western world supremacy of thought and learning, as well as dominance in civilization (Gordon, 1990). Advocacy for a "curriculum of inclusion" remains critical because "the high culture of the particular elite that conservative critics espouse has its blind spots, its absences, its systematic patterns of exclusion and discrimination" (Kalantzis & Cope, 1992). The pluralist ideal in American education requires a broader interpretation of the American society. The pluralist ideal rejects any "hierarchy of cultural values which places the achievement of Europe as some classical apex and relegates those of other cultures to a lesser status" (Nettleford, 1989). Students need to be exposed to scholarship that offers theory, analysis, and description of the perspectives and contributions of peoples who have been marginalized within the European tradition and peoples originating in Africa and Asia or in the indigenous cultures of the Americas. Most importantly, the content of a school's curriculum should be based on sound historical scholarship with a rejection of any curriculum that asserts or implies the inherent superiority of one race, gender, class, or region of the world over another.

> **IMPERATIVE**: *The use of all forms of standardized achievement and competency tests should be drastically curtailed with resources diverted to the development and use of more subtle, sensitive, educationally useful forms of assessment with the need for comparative data being met in ways that do not carry such massive human and individual costs.*

The need for new tests to assess and encourage new levels of learning is very real (Howe, 1991). There is little or no evidence that the proliferation of testing over the past 20 years has led to improved schooling, greater student effort, or high achievement and economic productivity (Darling-Hammond, 1991). Educators have accorded tests higher regard than their history warrants (Bond, 1986). Tests are frequently the instruments of politics rather than science, and test results tend to be more accurate as a general index of educational, economic, and social advantage than a measure of classroom effects on learning (Howe, 1991). Tests have been used to discriminate against the poor and minorities and often serve to stigmatize students with different labels and to narrow the social and occupational options open to students upon completion of school (Brookover, 1985). The insufficient understanding of intelligence and the unfair distinctions based on the misuse of tests result in mislabeling, misclassifying, and miseducating millions of Black and Latino students.

Many current practices in educational testing are barriers to efforts to identify and develop talent and to improve the functioning of school (National Commission on Testing & Public Policy, 1990). Standardized achievement and competency testing are not compatible with the idea that intelligence is complex, multi-dimensional, and changeable; public education needs to rethink outmoded conceptions of the role of schooling in the development of human potential (Keating & Oakes, 1988). The American democracy needs to invest its resources in public education with a greater commitment to the principle that the universal development of all of its citizens requires the kinds of assessment data that inform resource development, not resource selection.

> **IMPERATIVE:** *Tracking as an instructional or management device in public education should be ended with the grouping of students for instruction implemented in accordance with the principle that some students take longer to learn things than do other students but most students (perhaps over 90 percent) can master what schools have to teach as long as appropriate methods are used and students are allowed the time needed to learn a subject.*

In part, tracking practices in public education are supported under the false assumptions that differences among students diminish instructional effectiveness and that students can be assigned fairly and accurately to intellectually homogeneous groups for instruction (Keating & Oakes, 1988). Virtually all studies that address the assignment of students of different academic abilities to different tracks cite severe problems with this practice (Educational Development Center, 1985). Yet, tracking remains pervasive in public education despite significant evidence against its effectiveness and serious objections to its sociological effects. Tracking often limits "at risk" African American students to the lowest quality knowledge and the poorest prepared teachers and has a devastating impact on how teachers think about students and how students think about themselves (Boyer, 1983). African American students assigned to low ability classes are taught differently and receive less socially valued knowledge and skills. Students learn best when shifted from one group to another as the occasion and their needs demand. The desirability of any approach to grouping is dependent upon the degree to which it helps students to meet acceptable objectives.

> **IMPERATIVE:** *African American students need to attend schools that are staffed by a cadre of educators who are intelligent, articulate, and humanistic; who cling unequivocally to the principles of quality education and equal educational opportunity; who perceive the critical influences of external and internal factors which may facilitate or impede growth and development; who identify and use the personal, intellectual, and cultural development of their students; who demonstrate mastery of the applicable content areas; who have a repertory of the pedagogical skills needed for the specific instructional setting; and who measure their success by the degree to which students progress toward their potential.*

Large numbers of African American students suffer academic deficiencies that stem, in no small measure, from poor schooling and under-qualified and under-prepared teachers and administrators. Most school systems have not developed or adopted methods and procedures for weeding out incompetence within the system, for suitably rewarding those who excel in performance, and for finding ways of programming learning experiences so that results can be related to methods employed. Teachers tend to be overly reliant on repetitive instructional activities that foster passive student behavior and do poorly in teaching higher-order skills (College Entrance Examination Board, 1985). Instructional approaches in many schools create conditions that increase the difficulty of eliminating disadvantages rather than creating circumstances that minimize and compensate for initiate disadvantages (Goodlad, 1984). Effective schools are characterized by effective leaders (Edmonds, 1979), but many principals do not come into their principalships willing and prepared to travel the path of school improvement. Skilled and sensitive teachers and principals adjust to the multiple demands of a complex instructional environment. But teacher shortages are the most acute and the underqualified entrants into teaching the most numerous in urban school systems where most students of color attend school; African American students who could stand to benefit from classrooms with rich resources (motivated and well-prepared teachers, successful classmates, enriched curricula) nearly always get the least (Keating & Oakes, 1988).

> IMPERATIVE: *Educators in the provision of schooling for African American students should be committed to the teaching of alternate behavior as the aim of discipline rather than simply punishing bad or poor behavior*

Neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights applies only to teachers and principals. Many African American students are subjected to regulations that unduly curb their freedom of expression, dress, and behavior. African American students should not be placed in restrictive schools that seek to make them complacent and compliant individuals who will not challenge the status quo. Approaches to school discipline predicated on the notion that the student alone is the cause of poor behavior are ill-conceived and tend to increase students frustrations to the point that they express their resentment and hostility in the form of truancy or school misbehavior. Classroom management is broader than the notion of student discipline; it involves all of the things that educators should do to foster student involvement and cooperation in classroom activities and to establish a productive working environment (Sanford & Emmer, 1988). Discipline is a process in which the educator's respect for his or her students and the educator's understanding of the ability to manage the surface behavior of students and his or her own behavior go hand in hand. Discipline problems can often be traced to dysfunctions in the interpersonal climate and organizational pattern of the school. African American students need greater numbers of schools where they can reflectively examine problems, frustrations, aspirations, proposals, and values in the process of becoming increasingly self-autonomous, self-directing, and self-actualizing individuals capable of identifying and pursuing their own aims within the American society.

IMPERATIVE: *The setting of higher standards for student performance must be accompanied by a major restructuring of how public schools are funded in order to correct the inequalities of the various systems in which poor and Black children with the most severe needs receive substantially smaller resources than children from more affluent backgrounds.*

The public schools of the nation as they are currently structured and financed discriminate against poor and Black children. School systems with the greater concentrations and numbers of disadvantaged, disabled, and other students with special educational needs are entrapped in a funding support formula that attempts to educate the least wealthy children of the least well educated parents with the smallest amounts of money. In those school districts where the scope and complexity of the challenges to public education are maximized by the consequences of societal injustices and inequities on students, insufficient funds is the standard reason given for denying requests for improved or expanded programs and services for poor and Black students. Black students are at risk, not only from poverty, but also from the schools they attend (Levin, 1993). Black students in schools in the central cities and poor rural areas are routinely disadvantaged by the inequalities of school finance. If higher standards and accountability in public education are ever to be more than pious hopes, children born into poverty must have the resources needed to create learning environments for educational success (Taylor & Piche, 1993). It serves to perpetuate the injustices already heaped upon children from poverty for the major decision-makers in school reform not to address the need for a strategy for reconciling the wide variations in resources available to school systems across the nation.

Poverty is a profound and pervasive exacerbating factor in illness, disability, emotional distress, and educational failure. Family income, family educational level, and student educational achievement are closely correlated. Millions of Black children are born into poverty, and poor children are about twice as likely as non-poor children to be low-academic achievers (Keating & Oakes, 1988). Black children born into poverty have a high risk of succumbing to death, disease, disability, or injury, and are more likely to have parents with formidable vulnerabilities that expose them to multiple hazards (Hamburg, 1992). Students in mainly Black schools with high concentrations of students from low income families receive the least resources for remedying the effects of social and economic isolation (Keating & Oakes, 1988).

Mainly minority school systems are attempting to respond to needs which exceed the levels of available resources. Thus, the best of such systems, in their efforts to do something about most needs, develop programs and services that are a mile wide and an inch deep. Parents with the means to select schools for their children—public or private—tend to select schools which cost more than the schools they reject. The vast majority of Black students will either receive equal educational opportunity in mainly minority school systems or they will never experience such. School choice plans have not yet provided assurances that those Black children most in need of alternatives will have real choice available to them. Funding support for mainly minority school systems should be in concert with the principle that equal educational opportunity exists only when students of similar abilities and interests reach comparable levels of academic achievement, regardless of their socioeconomic circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Forget the good old days. They never existed for Black students in public education. The notion is false that America once had good school systems for Black students but has since let them dissipate. Today, as it has always been true in public education, good schools for Black students are in short supply and good school systems are non-existent (Scott, 1990). Mainly Black school systems have lost their credibility with much of the public they are supposed to serve. At risk Black students suffer the most from public schools that are ill-funded and ill-staffed to respond to the instructional and non-instructional needs of children who have been ravaged by racial and socioeconomic deprivation in their "separate but unequal" communities. Until the numerous deficiencies in the provision of schooling are corrected, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the potential capacity of public education to deliver instructional and non-instructional supports that help mass numbers of Black children overcome the ravages of racism and socioeconomic deprivation.

The people of one of the richest nations in the world buy what they want in education. There are vast differences in the resources Americans devote to their children's education, and Black students are enrolled in the greatest numbers in those school systems which are the most inequitably treated in the provision of funding support for public education. Subtle and not so subtle differences in curriculum, acourse content and teaching methods, the qualifications and commitment of school personnel, and the opportunity for innovation and enrichment at the school site determine which Black students receive a true education and which are trained to assume a permanent role in the nation's underclass (College Entrance Examination Board, 1985). Black students need considerably better options than racist White educators who refuse to treat them with respect and dignity and non-racist White and Black teachers who are philosophically and pedagogically ill-prepared to provide effective instruction for Black students in a racist society. The challenge remains for African Americans to secure the decision-making power that will provide assurances that their children are educated in schools that are safe, well-staffed, functional, and relevant to the educational needs of African Americans in a racist society.

REFERENCES

Ballard, A. (1973). *The Education of Black Folk*. New York: Harper & Rowe.

Baniziger, G. (1991, January). Letters to the editor. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Banks, J. A. (1971). Teaching ethnic minority studies with a focus on culture. Educational Leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*. Vol. 29. No. 2 113–117.

Bell, D. A. (1987). *And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Billingsley, A. (1974). *Black Families and the Struggle for Survival*. New York: Friendship Press.

Black Caucus position statement of the five-state organizing committee for community control which was addressed to the Harvard conference educational systems, January 25, 1968. Statement presented in *Phi Delta Kappa*, Vol. XLIX. No. 8, April, 1968, p. 452.

Bond, L. (1986). On New Horizons in Resting. In *Learning Research Development Center: A Twentieth Anniversary Profile*. (pp. 21–24). Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Boxill, B. (1992-93, Fall-Spring) Two Traditions in African American Philosophy. *The Philosophical Forum*. Vol. XXIV, No. 3. 119–135.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching.

Brookover, W. (1985). Can We Make Schools Effective for Minority Students? *Journal of Negro Education*. 54(3), 255–268.

Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. V. (1967). *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Vintage Press.

Clark, K. (1980, October). The Role of Race. *The New York Times Sunday Magazine*.

Clarke, J. H. (1972). Struggle is the Highest Form of Education. Paper presented at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Forum at Bank Street College, New York.

College Entrance Examination Board (1985). *Equality and Excellence: The Educational Status of Black Americans*. New York: Author.

Crummell, A. (1969). *Africa and America: Addresses and Discourses*. Miami: Mnemosyne Publishing Company. pp. 13, 14, and 18.

Cruse, H. (1987). *Plural but Equal*. New York: William Morrow.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). Measuring Schools is Not the Same as Improving Them. In *Voices From the Field: 30 Expert Opinions on America 2000*. The Bush administration strategy to reinvent America's schools. Washington, D.C.: William T. Grant Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship, and the Institute for Educational Leadership.

Davis, O. (1966). In N. Hentoff. *Our Children are Dying*. New York: Viking.

Douglass, F. (1963). As cited in August Mier's *Negro Thought in America*, 1880–1915. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1965). *The Souls of Black Folk*. Reprint in Three Negro classics. New York: Avon Books.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*. 37, 15–24.

Educational Development Center. (1985). *Improving Our Schools*. Newton, MA: Author.

Franklin, V. P. (1992). *Black Self-Determination*. Brooklyn, New York: Lawrence Hill Books.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gordon, V. V. (1990, August). Multicultural education: Some thoughts from an Afrocentric perspective. Black Issues in Higher Education. Vol. 7, No. 12.

Hamburg, D. (1992). *Children of Urban Poverty: Approaches to a Critical Urban Problem*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Harding, V. (1973). Black Reflections on the Cultural Ramifications of Identity. In M. D. Stent, W.R. Hazard, & H. Rivlin (Eds.), *Cultural Pluralism*, pp 103–113. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Harris, N. (1990, May) *Multicultural education in a changing world*. Black Issues in Higher Education.

Harris, R. L. Jr. (August, 1991). *Extracted from Afrocentrism in a Multicultural Democracy*. American Vision.

Higginbotham, A. L. (1978). *In the Matter of color: Race and the American Legal Process*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Howard, J. R. (1990, October). *In Teaching History, Avoid Adding Distortions*. Gannett Westchester Newspapers.

Howe, H. H. (1991). Seven Large Questions for America 2000's authors. *In Voices From the Field: 30 Expert Opinions on America 2000*. Op. Cit., 1991.

Kalantzis, M. & Cope, W. (1992, November). Multicultural education may prove to be the key issue of our epoch. Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. XXXIV, No. 11.

Kearse, G. S. (1980, January). In his review of W.J. *Wilson's The Declining Significance of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Reviewed in New Directions.

Keating, P. & Oakes, J. (1988). Access to knowledge: Breaking down school barriers to learning. Denver, CO: Education commission of the states.

Kirkland, F. (1993). Modernity and intellectual life in black. The Philosophical Forum. Vol. XXIV. Nos. 1–3, 136–165.

Levin, H. M. (1993). *In Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-income Students.* (Ed.) Iris C. Rotberg. Santa Monica, CA.: RAND.

Light, D., Keller, S., & Calhoun, C. (1989). *Sociology.* New York: The Free Press. (Fall-Spring, 1992–1993).

Marable, M. (1981, April). *Beyond the Race-Class Dilemma.* The Nation. 428, 431.

Marable, M. (1991). *Race, Reform, and Rebellion: The Second Reconstruction in Black America,* 1945–1990. Jackson, Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi.

Moody-Adams, M. M. (1992-93, Fall, Spring). *Race, Class, and the Social Construction of Self-respect.* The Philosophical Forum, Vol. XXIV, Nos. 1–3, 251–266.

National Negro Committee on Mr. Washington, 1910, (1910). As cited in *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States.* (Ed.) Herbert Aptheker. New York: Citadel Press, 1951.

National Commission on Resting and Public Policy. (1990). *From Gatekeeper to Gateway: Transforming Testing in America.* Chestnut Hill, MA: Author.

Nettleford, R. (1989, May). As cited in *Update,* p. 1.

Pine, G., & Hilliard, A.G. (1990). *Rx for Racism: Imperatives for American Schools,* Vol. 71, No. 8, 593-600, No. 8, 593–600.

Pink, W. (1984, Fall). *Creating Effective Schools.* Educational Forum, 49(1), 91–105.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (January, 1990). *Education that Works: An Action Plan for the Education of Minorities.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ray, L. R. (1979, March-April). *The Silicon Chip Strategy: Black Studies for Non-Blacks.* Cross Reference.

Reyes, M. de la luz, & Halcon, J.J. (1988). Racism in Academia: The Old Wolf Revisited. In N. M. Hidalgo, C.L. McDowell, and E. V. Siddle (Eds.) Facing racism in education. *Harvard Educational Review.*

Sanford, J. P. & Emmer, E. T. (1988). *Understanding Classroom Management: An Observation Guide.* Englewood Cliffs, N.H.: Prentice Hall.

Scott, H. J. (1990). Views of Black School Superintendents on Black Consciousness and Professionalism. *Journal of Negro Education.* Vol. 59, No. 2, 165–172.

Sizemore, B. A. (1985, Summer). Pitfalls and Promises of Effective Schools Research. *Journal of Negro Education.* Vol. 54, No. 3, 269–288.

Swinton, D. (1991). The Economic Status of African Americans: Permanent Poverty and Inequality. In *The State of Black America.* New York: National Urban League.

Task Force on Black Academic and Cultural Excellence. (1984). *Saving the African American Child.* (Washington, D.C.: National Alliance of Black School Educators.

Taylor, W. L. & Piche, D. M. (1993). *Federal Policy Options for Improving the Education of Low-income Students.* Santa Monica, CA.: RAND.

Visiting Committee on Minority Life and Education at Brown University. (1986). *The American University and the Pluralist Ideal.* Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University.

Woodson, C. G. (1977). *Mis-Education of the Negro.* Washington, D.C.: Associate Publishers. First published in 1933.

Young, C. A. (1972). Proglogue. In C. Young (ed.) *Black Experience: Analysis and Synthesis.* San Rafael, CA.: Leswing Press.

chapter 8

Developing a Multicultural Focus in Teacher Education: One Department's Story

Barbara J. Shade
University of Wisconsin–Parkside

This year, an institutional review by the North Central Accreditation team and audits by the state department of education, as well as the University of Wisconsin System, resulted in written accolades and commendations for the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Wisconsin–Parkside (NCA, 1992; UW Lateral Audit of Teacher Education Audit, 1993, Wisconsin DPI, 1992). The teams praised the high admission standards and the diversity of the faculty but particular attention was given to the multicultural emphasis of the program—a feature touted by all facets of the regional educational community as well as the students whom they interviewed. The evaluators observed that the department could be a model for others because today, more than any other time in history, classrooms need to be led by teachers who can work comfortably and effectively with the socially, racially, and culturally diverse students who comprise the current school population.

To implement a multicultural focus in a teacher preparation program in a predominantly white school is a social, intellectual, and emotional challenge for everyone involved. More important, it is a paradigmatic shift. A paradigm is a conceptual model that serves as a cognitive map to help organize experiences, ideas and actions. Adopting a multicultural paradigm around which to organize a teacher education program, therefore, becomes a set of organizing principles which transform not only the curriculum content and pedagogical strategies but also ultimately leads to a different way of perceiving and functioning by the faculty and the students.

How do you shift an entire program and faculty toward different ways of conceptualizing their approach to teacher preparation? This was probably a much easier task for this department than it might be for others because of the underlying foundation upon which the program began.

The University of Wisconsin–Parkside was one of two new campuses established in Wisconsin in 1968. This was the time at which the civil rights movement was having a monumental impact on Bob LaFollette's progressive state. One by-product of that era was the development of a set of required human relations rules for all teacher preparation institutions by the Department of Public Instruction. Believing that the mission of the young campus was to stimulate major social change in the surrounding region, the first chancellor of the campus mandated that the teacher education program at UW–Parkside find a way to implement these codes to the fullest extent possible (Petrach, 1983). To respond to this challenge, a committee was appointed which included both teacher education faculty and representatives of the other departments involved in teacher certification. The resulting plan presented to the chancellor met not only the letter but the intention of the law and called for the appointment of a director of human relations who had a multicultural education background as well as the hiring of a diverse staff. This program became one which was perceived by the faculty and state education department as one of the strongest and most effective human relations programs in the system (Petrach, 1983; Wisconsin DPI Review, 1987, 1992).

The idea that the department should enhance its program by broadening the concept of "human relations training" to multiculturally oriented curriculum emerged in the early eighties. The thought was precipitated in large measure by several major factors. One was the growing awareness of the dramatic increase of racially different students in the districts in which most of the individuals, licensed by the department, sought employment. The second was the adoption of the "Design for Diversity" by the university system of which this campus is a part. By this act, the regents committed all campuses to attend to the many issues being raised by the changing demographics throughout the state particularly in our region. A third, and perhaps the most influential factor, was the call for the reform of teacher preparation programs in ways which would prepare teachers to work in schools where social, ethnic, cultural changes are having a dramatic effect on the achievement of the students.

In Wisconsin, the Department of Public Instruction decided to meet its obligation to respond to the request for alterations by obtaining legislative support to set very specific standards for the teacher education programs in the state. The passage of these additional mandates led all campuses, including UW–Parkside, to rethink their mission and programs. During this process, it became clear that the rather prescriptive standards had the potential of homogenizing teacher education programs in the system and that survival for a small campus probably required a highly specialized focus which would clearly differentiate it from the larger nearby campuses. With the issues of diversity and survival creating some major concerns, the vice chancellor/dean of faculty at that time wondered if perhaps the department might not better position itself and the campus for future trends if it capitalized on its strength—that of human relations and multicultural education.

The suggestion was not immediately embraced—at least formally. No major faculty proposals were written, no formal discussions held, and no formal faculty vote was taken. The department had a strong human relations component and a diverse faculty.[1] More important, several of the newly added faculty were gaining a national reputation through their publications and staff development work. With these elements in mind, the unstated question was: "What else really needs to be done?" To answer that question, time was granted to one of the center proposers to observe classes and interview faculty to determine the extent to which the conceptual model of "schooling and human diversity" as interpreted as individual differences had become a part of the course work offered in the department. The report (Sleeter, 1986) presented at a summer faculty retreat detailed the following findings:

1. Although some mention of various issues which pertained to adapting classroom and teaching to students from a variety of backgrounds seemed to be mentioned by many of the faculty in their classes, the observer noted that the references were largely abstract statements with very few concrete examples. The ideas were exhortations to the prospective students to be aware of the issue but pedagogical approaches which would work in the situation were not promoted or addressed.
2. When diversity was defined in a very broad term, it was still found that areas such as learning styles, gender issues, socioeconomic differences, language and dialectic impacts, ethnocultural differences and even family structure were not integrated concepts which had found their way either into the syllabi presented to the students nor in the class discussion.
3. Teaching in ways to accommodate individual differences, while advocated, was not modeled by the faculty. For the most part, the traditional mode of lecture-group discussion was the way in which future teachers were taught and assessment of what they learned came through standard paper and pencil measures with a few projects and group pre-

sentations added to the strategies. While it was recognized that the quality of teaching by the teacher education faculty was considered above average, there was some concern that teacher education faculty did not recognize the need to model strategies which accommodate cultural differences.

The faculty accepted these observations as true and entered into a more focused discussion of what changes could be made in the program that would address these concerns. They decided that the concept of individual differences was a valid approach but that perhaps each faculty member should specialize in the study of one group, and incorporate their focus in their particular classes. The areas proposed included giftedness, students with special needs, gender issues or one of the major ethnic groups (i.e., African, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American communities). Not only did the faculty make a verbal commitment to this approach, they were asked to designate their specialty in writing, to allow their special foci to be advertised in the program promotion, and to ensure that the topics and ideas were included in their syllabi (Wisconsin DPI Review, 1987).

Without any substantive discussion about underlying assumptions of the change, the syllabi began to reflect more references to different ethnic groups and women's issues. Some members insisted upon concentrating on problems of lower socioeconomic class and the impact of poverty on schooling, tacitly equating poverty with different ethnocultural groups. Soon there appeared to be a general campus perception that the Department of Teacher Education had a multicultural orientation. It appeared that this assumption was based largely on the verbal declarations and comments by faculty, students, cooperating teachers and administrators associated with the program. Furthermore, the campus and the surrounding communities were becoming more aware of the speeches, publications, and workshops being conducted throughout the country by two faculty members. In addition, more of the graduates of the program seemed to be making a conscious choice to work in schools with highly diverse populations and principals and other administrators in the area voluntarily expressed great satisfaction with those individuals and their abilities to work in inner-city schools.

At this point of this rather quiet dialogue, an opportunity was presented by the University of Wisconsin system to designate centers of excellence on each campus as a way of defining areas in which each campus had strength. A formal proposal to seek designation of the Department of Teacher Education as a center of excellence was prepared by the division chair and faculty member most involved in the area and presented to the faculty for consideration and support (Shade

& Sleeter, 1988). It appeared to the chair that this could be a mechanism for making a formal written proposal to the faculty about a multicultural focus and its implications and, if fortunate enough, actually obtain money to facilitate faculty discussions and course development. Two nationally known consultants were brought in to facilitate the conceptualization. The goals proposed for the center were to:

1. Provide EuroAmerican individuals sufficient knowledge, strategies, and methods for working with students from different cultural backgrounds to facilitate and strengthen their ability to work in metropolitan districts.
2. Recruit and prepare African American, Hispanic American, Native American and Asian American individuals for the metropolitan teaching force.
3. Regularize the presentation and teaching of the techniques, knowledge, strategies for working with multicultural student bodies throughout the teaching certification program.
4. Identify and record models of curricular and teaching excellence which enhance the academic achievement of culturally different students.
5. Conduct research and dissemination activities which contribute to the literature on teacher education with a multicultural focus.

When presented to the faculty, the proposal was not vociferously opposed nor was it enthusiastically endorsed. The best description of faculty reaction is that of positive neutrality. Without a significant amount of discussion or acclamation, the group agreed to forward the idea to the university campus committee who would make the selection. Of interest was the fact that the proposal requesting the designation of the department as a center of excellence was one of two ideas submitted by the campus.

The department was not selected by the reviewers; however, the campus community, particularly the administration, reaffirmed their willingness to support the department in their efforts to achieve excellence in multicultural education. With this reinforcement, the department leadership began to exert stronger, but subtle pressure to develop a "multicultural focus" to be integrated throughout the program rather than in just two classes designated as the "human relations" program. In the course of time, the faculty agreed to consider the idea of diversity as "individual differences." While the concept of "multiculturalism" still was not the pivotal point, the faculty proposed that students could be assisted in paying closer attention to subject matter and teacher strategy modification as ways of facilitating the development of low achieving students. As the discussions continued, the faculty further acknowledged that the more commonly accepted ways of classroom management, lesson presentation, student assessment, and student behavior might also need to be questioned. In addition, they agreed that the concept of different cognitive learning styles and other sociocultural variations which impact learning should be brought to the consciousness of the students as well as the faculty.

Each year, thereafter, the momentum grew. Curricular changes within each class became more inclusive, faculty development sessions were held to discuss the issues, and the faculty agreed that the field experiences in which students engaged throughout their professional program would be within urban settings, at least for some portion of the semester. In addition, the administration, supervision and development of the precollege programs for the campus that focuses solely on working with students of color was transferred to the School of Education. This program provided opportunities to both students and faculty to experiment with different teaching strategies and test out their perceptions of the students in a carefully structured situation.

In addition to these efforts, when hiring new faculty, particular attention was given to the prospective candidate's research and interest in working in the area of urban and/or multicultural education. Now additional faculty members are publishing in the area of multicultural education which further reinforces the concept of the department with a multicultural focus. Recently, the faculty added to the admission procedure a requirement that each newly admitted student must read and acknowledge their understanding that multicultural orientation is the focus of the program in which they are being prepared. Just as important as the curriculum and the faculty was the effort to increase the number of students of color in the teacher education program. Not only does a diverse student body validate the emphasis, it serves to enhance the class discussions and interactions.

What does it take to integrate a multicultural focus into a teacher education program? In this instance, one might conclude that it requires a strong pull and push of numerous environmental forces such as:

1. A highly supportive administration as well as a campus whose mission and focus reinforces the concept.

2. Rewards, mandates, and encouragement from the state department of education. (It should be noted that without individuals in the leadership positions in that system with a clear desire and commitment to change, the mandates would not have been forthcoming.)

3. A strong interdependence between the department and the school districts which encouraged the university to respond to their identified needs.

4. The opportunity to recruit and hire over half of the staff within the department during the ten-year period in which the change was being implemented.

Of course, while all of these elements are important, the most crucial factor which impacts on making a paradigmatic shift is the commitment of the faculty and staff. This is a dimension over which there is little influence because it involves individuals making their own personal decisions about the extent to which they wish to participate in the change. Promoting the concept of multiculturalism as a part of the material they teach and the pedagogy they model depends on faculty attitudes, values, belief systems and perceptions of people of color.

MAKING THE PARADIGM SHIFT: THE PERSONAL DIMENSION

When a paradigm or concept is accepted, it assumes that the individuals involved embrace the core assumptions around which the paradigm was constructed (Vallance, 1986). In moving to adopt a multicultural orientation within teacher education, the faculty involved must define for themselves what will be the underlying philosophy from which they will teach and which goals will be accomplished. This becomes a particularly difficult task because multicultural education tends to mean different things to different people ranging from perceiving it as an effort to reduce prejudice and racism, fostering tolerance and a commitment to pluralism within a democratic society to improving the academic achievement of minority students (Willis, 1993). In her recent synthesis of the field, Gay (1993) points out that many of the differences in conceptualization are semantic rather than substantive. Underlying any of the definitions, however, are two major theses that multicultural education: a) represents a philosophical point of view about how ethnicity, cultural pluralism, equity of opportunity and sociopolitical problems should be addressed; and b) is a methodology for educational reform both at the institutional as well as the curriculum and instructional level.

Although the basic definition of the concept was not clearly articulated at the onset of the move for change, this department has seemingly evolved toward the goal articulated by Irvine. Irvine (1992) believes that a teacher education program designed to foster diversity must be one which provides future teachers basic understanding as to how best to restructure teaching so that all students have equal access to knowledge.

Approaching the concept with this objective has precipitated the examination of the following hypotheses as potential major core assumptions articulated and promoted throughout the program:

- Multiculturalism incorporates diverse ways of knowing;
- Multiculturalism must become the primary basis for curricular thought;
- Multiculturalism provides a means for increasing student motivation;
- Multiculturalism requires diversity in communication;
- Multiculturalism is a source of different perspectives; and
- Multiculturalism defines and allows a wide variety of accepted patterns of social interactions in the classroom.

While the acceptance of these core assumptions established the framework for content changes, it became very clear that the demonstration and implementation of pedagogical and other curricular approaches is highly dependent on the faculty's underlying attitudes (Pintrich, Marx & Boyle, 1993). Herein lies the potential conflict and inhibitor of a complete paradigm shift for most teacher educators who do not fully comprehend how to translate these ideas into their own teaching and practice because of their own previous history and experience. As Kennedy (1991) points out, both faculty and prospective teachers have spent a great deal of time as classroom participant observers. This time immersed in well-established Eurocentric cultural approach to schooling has produced some strongly entrenched beliefs about what teaching and learning is about as well as how to respond to ethnoculturally different students or students who do not learn in the same way in which the faculty is comfortable. Altering the faculty's perceptions in ways which can facilitate a multicultural orientation means modifying a lifetime of acquired habits and attitudes. It requires individuals to explore new possibilities about how to strengthen the intellectual life of the classroom by including additional material, how to approach and transform academic subject matter using new ideas and new perspectives and a different knowledge base (Banks, 1993), and how to create activities which are designed to engage a broader range of students using a variety of pedagogical methods (Kennedy, 1991). Additionally, teacher education faculty must re-examine their definitions of accepted classroom behavior, the nature of intellectual work, the nature of school subjects and how prospective teachers should be taught in order to promote better learning. Perhaps the most difficult reconceptualization demanded is the requirement to rethink the meaning of the concept of intelligence, what should be the accepted way of approaching and learning information, and how children of color should be viewed in relationship to their ability to learn and succeed.

These are some fundamental issues which are often ignored or left unaddressed because they raise some uncomfortable questions about some basic values and belief systems which have been long established and which faculty, themselves, may not yet recognize as being a hindrance to the shift to multicultural teacher education. If the issues are addressed, teacher educators will find that they must make major additions in their knowledge base, become more aware of their own cultural orientation, and increase their sensitivity about their own behavioral approaches to different ethnic/racial groups. This transformation becomes a major shift in frames of reference as well as contexts and positions which have been personally held for many years. These are not easy transitions for any human being and, thus, have the potential for producing great anxiety and hostility.

However, confronting and resolving these issues is absolutely imperative if a multicultural focus is to become an institutionalized framework for preparing teachers to teach. The "teacher" is the most important unit of analysis for building change within any classroom because this is where the major interaction and competence building occurs. As Wise (1979) points out, the ultimate responsibility for good education and student achievement rests with the individual with the most influence on this dimension. That is, the teacher. Teachers establish the climate, serve as the mentor and academic coach, and make life-defining judgments about students. It is, therefore, incumbent on teacher preparation institutions to ensure that the teachers staffing those classrooms are those who can effectively connect diverse learners to important subject matter knowledge (Kennedy, 1991). This cannot be done unless teacher educators, themselves, realize what changes must be made by teachers facing the challenges.

How do you implement a multicultural focus in a teacher education program in which the students and faculty are largely nonminority? Obviously there are two approaches. On one hand you can do as was done at the University of Wisconsin–Parkside and allow the approach, the focus, and the curriculum to gradually evolve. This has the advantage of allowing the faculty for whom this is an uncomfortable experience to buy into the process at the level with which they have the most comfort or make a informed choice to leave. It also tends to be less confronting and divisive. If, however, this is the avenue selected there are many environmental factors which need to be in place to provide the appropriate structure and force field to continue the movement, not the least of which is a strong administrative acceptance as well as a reasonable university and school community climate.

The other approach is one that is planned, debated, and carefully constructed. Elements for this approach include having a leader or a nucleus within the faculty to shepherd the idea, the opportunity for many consistent discussions about the goals and philosophy that will undergird the curriculum, and the freedom to restructure the delivery system in ways which are congruent with the goals and defined curriculum.

Regardless of which approach is taken, changing teacher education is a tremendous task that will only be accomplished on an incremental, and developmental but, most of all, personal basis. Only when all of the elements are in place can it be said that the paradigm shift has truly occurred.

NOTE

[1] In the first ten years of existence, the teacher education program had two of its fourteen positions occupied by African Americans. Later, two additional faculty of color were hired. Today, although the number of faculty positions have been significantly reduced and there has been staff turnover, the department can still boast that 50% of the tenure-track faculty positions are occupied by nonwhite individuals.

REFERENCES

Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, 22, 4–14.

Gay, G. (1993). A synthesis of multicultural education ideas and ideals. Unpublished manuscript presented to the conference on multicultural education, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Irvine, J. I. (1992). Making teacher education culturally responsive. In Dilworth, M. E. (Ed.) *Diversity in Teacher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 779–92.

Kennedy, M. M. (1991, Spring). An agenda for research on teacher learning. East Lansing, Michigan: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

North Central Association Program Accreditation Report, October, 1992.

Petrach, S.E. (1983). *Program Evaluation of the Division of Education's Human Relations Program*. Master's paper, University of Wisconsin–Parkside.

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. *Review of Educational Research*, 63, 167–199.

Shade, B. J. & Sleeter, C. E. (1988). Proposal to the University of Wisconsin System for a Center of Excellence in Schooling and Human Diversity.

Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Internal report on observations of urban/multicultural inclusion and general programmatic tendencies. Unpublished memorandum to the Teacher Education faculty, University of Wisconsin–Parkside.

University of Wisconsin Lateral Audit of Teacher Education, 1993.

Vallance, E. (1986). A second look at conflicting conceptions of curriculum. In *Theory Into Practice*, 25, 25–30.

Willis, S. (1993, September). Multicultural Teaching: Meeting the challenges that arise in practice. *ASCD Curriculum Update*, 1–8.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Program Review of University of Wisconsin–Parkside, Division of Education, October 1987.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Program Review of University of Wisconsin–Parkside, School of Education, November, 1992.

Wise, A. (1979). *Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

chapter 9

Restructuring American Schools: A Perspective on Testing and Assessment

Trevor E. Sewell
Temple University

Constance V. Hines
University of South Florida

Whether we begin the discussion of educational reform by assuming that the quality of American public schools is so dismal that only a complete overhaul will suffice (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Stevenson, 1992) or whether we believe that the situation is problematic but not catastrophic (Berliner, 1993; Bracey, 1993), it is clear that America is on a course of radically reformulating educational policies, practices and delivery systems with the objective of improving schools. While many of the stakeholders in the American educational system are delighted by this current focus on education, it is only fair to say that the recent track record of these reform movements is not encouraging. After a decade of legislative mandates, recommendations by blue ribbon commissions and local reform initiatives, the results have been conspicuously disappointing (Clark & Astuto, 1994). As several thoughtful analysts have pointed out, the failure of these recent waves of reform is not solely because the commitment to change was weak or nonexistent, but rather because these restructuring initiatives were often rooted in unfounded theoretical assumptions, questionable political policies, devastating inequalities in resources and ill-conceived educational practices.

One example of a questionable practice in the recent educational reform movement has been the consistent call to bring about change and improvement through school restructuring. The argument is straightforward: Since students are not achieving at acceptable levels in our schools, we should reconstitute the way schools are structured, organized and administered, thereby eliminating institutional barriers to learning. While this idea has some arguments in its favor, it is a little like an industry deciding that the best way to improve its product is to redesign its assembly line. If, in fact, the product is inferior, producing it more efficiently may have a short-term positive effect but can do nothing in the long run to remediate the essential flaws in the way the product is designed. To carry this analogy further, the seductive call to adopt free-market competitive principles (see, for example, Moffett, 1994) is simply another way of focusing the blame for the alleged failure of our educational system on the way schools are structured, rather than on rethinking basic principles about the way education is conceived in this society.

Obviously, educational reformers who call for significant school restructuring have more in mind than tinkering at the periphery, yet transforming individual schools in the face of entrenched bureaucracies and deeply embedded educational principles of dubious worth are instances of a troubling dilemma in many reform strategies. Darling-Hammond (1993), in an insightful call to reframe the school reform agenda, points out that: "Efforts to make our current education system perform more efficiently have shifted to initiatives that aim for the fundamental redesign of schools, of approaches to teaching and learning and of goals for schooling" (p. 753). Yet it is evident from cumulative data that the reform movement has not yielded clear, definitive directions as to what conceptual framework, educational practices and/or organizational behaviors should guide the reform process.

Amid the flurry of professional activities related to the reform agenda, assessment has emerged as one of the central issues in curricular development and the reformulation of instructional goals. Even more centrally, assessment, and especially assessment achieved through large-scale, norm-referenced standardized tests, is still viewed by many as the key component in satisfying the public's interest in accountability. This chapter will focus on testing and assessment practices in the school restructuring debate as a means of achieving high-quality education. We will argue for the use of assessment practices that integrally link instruction and assessment because we believe that this type of assessment yields instructional benefits that are not produced by typical, large-scale, norm-referenced, standardized tests with their emphasis on sorting, tracking and accountability.

STANDARDIZED TESTS AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Whatever the surface ideology may be, the underlying reality is that educational reform in America has been driven by national goals embedded in one form or another of political ideology. Thus, the impetus for each wave of new reform is usually given central explanatory support by powerfully articulated national priorities associated with one form or another of national crisis: military dominance (e.g., meeting the challenge of Sputnik); or economic dominance (overcoming our competitive economic disadvantage in the global marketplace). It is in this context of national political objectives that the use of standardized tests as measures of cognitive ability, academic achievement or "competence" has played a pre-eminent role in shaping the history of American education and is currently viewed by policy makers as a catalyst for school reform.

Interestingly, despite the increasing emphasis on norm-referenced, standardized tests to meet the public demands for accountability, the debate over their use is intensely acrimonious. This debate has generated an unprecedented professional interest in producing new forms of assessment that are viewed as innovative or "alternative," thereby having the power to transform traditional assessment practices. But why is such a dominant feature of American education enmeshed in such persistent criticism? Seen from the analytic perspective of an opportunity allocation process, Gifford (1989) argues that:

> Tests determine who is designated as gifted and talented, who competes for admission at prestigious colleges and universities, who enters the bidding for highly desired and economically rewarding employment slots, who wins places in job training or apprenticeship programs, and who will practice particular crafts or professions. (p. 3)

Viewed from this widely acknowledged and influential role in high-stakes decisions, the ubiquitous use of tests transcends any reasonable public demand for accountability. Nevertheless, since accountability has become a key factor as a vehicle for reform in the mold-breaking school restructuring process, its association with standardized testing warrants particular attention. Both *America 2000* and *Goals 2000*, the two most recent statements of a national agenda for education, call for new and universally administered standardized tests in the core areas of mathematics, science, English, geography, and social studies. The highly touted international achievement standards, the merits of widely differing restructuring efforts, the differential effects of various instructional strategies, and individual differences in learning ability and achievement are all expected to be assessed by these tests. This point is excellently made by Garcia and Pearson (1994):

> Politicians and business leaders point to our lack of centralized educational system with clearly established standards and a national assessment system that evaluates the extent to which students measure up. In these eyes, standards and accompanying assessments would drive everything from classroom instruction to instructional materials to teacher education. Accordingly, the more that key educational milestones can be tied to the attainment of standards, the greater the likelihood that reform will move ahead. (p. 337)

Underlying many of the core assumptions of the reform movement, then, is the belief that all the significant outcomes of education can be objectively measured, and the preferred method of such measurement is the large-scale, norm-referenced, standardized test. And since, implicitly or explicitly, assessment continues to drive the curriculum, the nature of this assessment has become one of the major issues of concern and controversy in contemporary educational practice (Shapiro, Sewell, & DuCette, 1995). For us, the critical aspect of this controversy is the impact that norm-referenced, standardized tests have on children from less privileged backgrounds.

Given the expectation that the current assessment-driven reform process will use test results for high-stakes decisions, the societal impact and educational consequences for disadvantaged children, ethnic and language minorities and those who have not been privileged by traditional testing practices present issues of enormous complexity.

In the United States, children from the poorest and least educated families consistently perform poorly on standardized measures of cognitive ability and academic achievement. In a society in which gross inequalities in life experiences are arguably based on historical, racial and structural factors, discrepancies in test performance were often interpreted to imply racial differences rather than sociocultural differences or racial inequities. This line of reasoning was particularly pronounced in the use of intelligence tests with children of color.

From its inception in American society, intelligence testing incorporated a political philosophy that emphasized differential treatment based on the belief that fixed biological differences exist between groups (Kamin, 1974). The fact that labeling, tracking and special class placement have become central issues of controversy simply reflects the historical fact that an individual's measured ability was viewed as a valid indication of the individual's educational potential and an adequate explanation of that individual's achieved social and economic position. The fact that the individual's early childhood experience is quite sufficient to explain differences in test performance whichever prejudice is maintained--race/ethnicity or social class (Sewell, Price, & Karp, 1993)--is often overlooked or ignored. Thus, there can be no charitable explanation for the lack of insight to realize that sociocultural factors are deeply implicated in performance on standardized tests of cognitive ability. What is most disturbing is that the narrow definition of educability, conceptualized in a cultural context insensitive to the educational aspirations of poor and minority children, was based on discredited psychological theories, and ill-conceived educational practices, and justified by the scientific merits of standardized tests of intelligence.

PSYCHOMETRIC THEORY AND THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF TESTING

With respect to the testing of minorities and poor children, we concur with Shapiro, Sewell, and DuCette (1995) and others that the rich history of the highly sophisticated psychometric model on which norm-referenced, standardized tests are based is tarnished by a systematic and philosophically charged insensitivity to the poor, to members of the lower classes (Schiff & Lewontin, 1986), and to minorities (Larry P. v. Wilson Riles, 1979; Samuda; 1975; Sewell, 1979, 1981). But given the cultural context in which the technology of testing was developed, it is no wonder that the psychometric underpinnings naturally incorporated values that stacked the decks against large segments of society (Gould, 1981). It is in this context that the critique of testing as a technology seems most insightful. Madaus (1993), for example, cited the work of Winner (1986), a philosopher of technology, who pointed out that:

> [There] are instances in which the very process of technical development is so thoroughly biased in a particular direction that it regularly produces results heralded as wonderful breakthroughs by some social interests and crushing setbacks by others. In such cases it is neither correct nor insightful to say "Some one intended to do somebody else harm." Rather, one must say that the technological deck has been stacked in advance to favor certain social interests and that some people were bound to receive a better hand than others. (p. 25)

The point that Madaus and Winner are making has been a recurring theme of many authoritative voices who, from an historical perspective, have linked the scientific accomplishments of the testing technology to an insidious political ideology masked in a scientific cloak (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Gould, 1981; Kamin, 1974; Lawler, 1978; Schiff & Lewontin, 1986).

This historical perspective typically begins with the translation of the French-originated Binet Intelligence test in America at the turn of the century (Terman, 1916). Paradoxically, this test, which was developed for the limited purpose of remedial educational instruction, soon became a pre-eminent scientific instrument suitable for solving a host of social problems. For example, the test was used to justify the massive deportation of immigrants in the 1920s, since these immigrants had significantly lower average test scores than native Americans, and since such an action was viewed as a demonstration of the political will to improve the intelligence of the American population. Similarly, the frequency with which minorities were related to segregated special classes, based on interpretations of their inherent cognitive limitations, also demonstrated the dramatic shift from the original purpose of the Binet test to purposes that were pernicious, political and problematic. Not surprisingly, Gould (1981), noting the violations of Binet's principles, stated: "If Binet's principles had been followed, and his tests consistently used as he intended, we would have been spared a major misuse of science in our century" (p. 155).

Science and the prestige of the scientific method have provided the major impetus for the dominance of psychometric theory in American education. Because norm-referenced standardized tests are perceived to be solidly anchored in the widely accepted scientific framework, and because this framework has been so dominant throughout this century, enormous credibility has been provided for the multifaceted uses of these standardized tests. Paradoxically, this credibility has coexisted for many years with persistent criticism and public concern. This is evident in a wide range of educational activities, but is most clearly seen in those contexts in which psychology is applied to education. While there are many reasons for this, the primary cause would seem to be that psychology is the one discipline that has most embraced the standard scientific method and has been most concerned with educational application.

The elegant and sophisticated accomplishment of developing and refining standardization procedures, creating validity and reliability methodologies, and establishing a wide variety of other technical properties of standardized tests is acclaimed as one of psychology's major achievements. It was psychology which informed us that differential capacity in human ability exists; and it was psychologists who developed the norm-referenced, standardized tests to measure these abilities. More specifically, it was psychology that developed, refined and proselytized the concept of the IQ; and it has been psychologists who have measured, theorized about and profited from this concept. But the rapid increase in the practical application of the IQ test, which was developed for vastly different purposes than the application often became, was matched by critics who recognized that the surge in test usage, particularly ability measurement, was "filled with emotional and confusing mixture of science, politics and philosophy" (Carroll & Horn, 1981, p. 1012).

A similar observation was made by Eckberg (1979) who noted that testing did not develop in a social vacuum: "Instead it developed in the context of a set of widely shared beliefs in a hierarchy that had implications both for scientific conceptualization and for political practice" (p. 135). With respect to both the scientific and political elements of testing, the history of testing can be characterized as a complex intertwined relationship, particularly with regard to the testing of minorities. For as Mercer (1989) and others have pointed out, all of the critical elements of the IQ test, including the test questions, the normative sample and the procedures used for validation, reflected American values and a clear conceptualization of how intelligence and achievement should be distributed across gender, race, and social class (Haney, 1981; Kamin, 1974; Montagu, 1975). In this context, it has been frequently hypothesized that the tests were designed and based on limited and highly selective content, which was reflective of the restrictive middle-class sociocultural background of the normative sample, to yield scores supportive of the power, status and privileges of certain segments of the population. For it is incomprehensible, given the care with which the scientific method was applied in the construction of these tests, that cultural differences, persistent and crushing poverty, and linguistic factors were simply ignored as having any causative links to the differential group performance on standardized tests.

Yet the vast literature on testing has portrayed standardized tests of ability as fair and unbiased for all segments of the population (Cleary, Humphreys, Kendrick, & Wesman, 1975) despite overwhelming evidence and claims to the contrary (Jackson, 1975). It is beyond the scope and purpose of this chapter to analyze the charges of fairness and bias in standardized tests. It is quite relevant, however, to cite the explosion in litigations that cast doubt on the notion that standardized tests are unbiased scientific instruments, particularly for minority individuals. (*Diana v. State Board of Education*, 1970; Elliot, 1987; *Guadalupe v. Temple Elementary School District*, 1972) Citing recent trials that focused on test validation issues, Rebell (1989) argued that "probably the most exhaustive analyses of psychometric issues undertaken anywhere occur in class action litigations of controversial tests" (p. 137).

This extensive judicial intervention and oversight in public policy related to the construction, validation and use of tests emerge from a clearly recognized threat to individual rights in the allocation of opportunities. In this judicial process in which constitutional rights are typically invoked concerning the invalid use of tests, a key educational issue has been the practice of using these tests as the sole measure to determine eligibility for special class placement. The landmark judicial decision in which the court permanently enjoined the state of California from using standardized ability tests to determine the placement of African-American children in classes for the educable mentally retarded was precedent-setting and affirms the harmful effects noted by the critics (*Larry P. v. Wilson Riles*, 1979). According to Rebell (1989), the extensive and perceptive analysis of the history of IQ tests in this trial led to the refutation that innate intellectual ability was implicated in racial differences in test performance. But regardless of whether the central contemporary issue was innate or acquired knowledge in test performance, the fundamental outcome of the lawsuit was a challenge to the gatekeeping function of IQ tests that ultimately led to a disproportionate number of black students in "dead-end classes," thus a denial of equal educational opportunity.

The complexity of judicial intervention in social science issues is exemplified in the *Larry P. v. Riles* (1979) and *PASE v. Hannon* (1980) litigations in which the court banned the use of IQ tests in the former and upheld their use in the latter on essentially similar presented evidence. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the *PASE v. Hannon* (1980) case is the unorthodox behavior of the judge in rejecting the testimony of expert witnesses on both sides as "doctrinal commitments to a preconceived idea." Although the outcome of the *PASE* litigation was undoubtedly welcomed by the proponents of IQ tests, its contribution to psychometric practice is quite limited since Judge Grady, under the robe of judicial power, took on the technical expertise of a psychometrician and based his decision on his personal analysis of test items. Bersoff (1981) is quite correct in his assertion that "the method by which Judge Grady reached that judgment is embarrassingly unsophisticated and ingenious" (p. 1049). Thus, given the ambiguity generated by the courts concerning the use of IQ tests in schools and how these scores are interpreted, it is perhaps constructive to examine the purpose of norm-referenced, standardized tests for the instructional benefit of students. If testing and assessment have the potential to fuel the educational reform process, as many have suggested (see, for example, Wiggins, 1989), it is the instructional value of standardized tests or their alternatives that must be understood.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL USE OF TESTS

The emphasis on the social concerns over intelligence testing is merely one element of the public concern over standardized tests. Suggesting that deeper insight into the public concerns over testing must consider the success of testing as a social enterprise, Haney (1981) noted how social attitudes and values influence testing issues that are mainly technical and theoretical. One such social issue is the selection function of tests, which is usually justified on technical grounds, even when the fundamental issue of negative social consequences is invoked. For example, the selection of students in an educational setting for tracking or other categorical placement is a process for which there is remarkably strong empirical evidence of predictive validity as justification. One would assume that there are equally sound empirical data indicating the beneficial results of such selection, but such evidence has either not been collected or has not been reported. Instead, one finds a sophisticated philosophical rationale used to justify the use of tests, often with little or no connection to the literature that has reported the test's technical properties. It would seem as if the area of testing has two extensive, though largely non-overlapping, realms of discourse: a highly sophisticated and technical literature, which is strongly data-based, concerning the psychometric properties of tests; and a deeply philosophical and theoretical literature, which is not data-driven, concerning the social consequences of testing for groups and individuals within these groups.

But even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that standardized tests are unbiased, there is still little evidence that such large-scale tests produce significant instructional benefits for those who must take them (Heller, Holzman, & Messick, 1982). Nevertheless, let us assume that the technical features of standardized tests are scientifically sound enough (e.g., predictive validity and reliability) to justify their use for selection and placement in educational settings. Even with all of these requirements in place, does it necessarily follow that the tests will be able to contribute to instructional goals consistent with the changes desired by the educational reformers? If, as many educational writers contend, the central purpose of testing and assessment must shift away from selection and placement and move toward the support of instruction, will the scientific support be upheld or should traditional testing be abandoned as authoritative critics have suggested?

On this question let us turn to the observation of Glaser and Silver (1994) who have pointed out that selection and placement, on one hand, and the assessment of educational outcomes, on the other, were the two lines of historical development from which the measurement of intellectual abilities emerged. Viewed in this historical context, testing and assessment have played a dominant role in supporting the educational practice by which individuals were labeled and, thereafter, excluded from the mainstream of schools according to so-called abilities measured prior to instructional intervention.

What is troublesome about the overreliance on tests for this purpose can be summarized in two related concerns:

1. Test performance, conceived as a summation of one's learning experiences reflecting cultural background and the quality of schooling to which one has been exposed, cannot adequately capture the intellectual capabilities of individuals, particularly those whose lives have been battered by poverty, social isolation and racial inequities. Moreover, even within the psychometric framework of assessment, Sternberg (1988) and Gardner (1983) would argue that the range of abilities being measured in conventional tests is too narrowly conceptualized.
2. The history of testing, when viewed from the perspective of its role for selection purposes, has shown that differential selection for placement, based on the politics of race, social class and gender, remains an historical legacy, which is still of fundamental significance. The reality of this pernicious practice is perceptively identified and articulated by Glaser and Silver (1994): "Even in current educational practice, tests are frequently used to sort students into instructional 'tracks' that provide differential opportunities and have differential expectations and the general failure of this process to increase educational outcome has been amply demonstrated" (p. 397).

We recognize that the technical adequacy of standardized tests, especially the IQ test, for predicting academic achievement, justifies the contention that the test is valid for all subgroups of the population (Cleary , Humphreys & Wesman, 1975; Jensen, 1980). But if the quality of educational programming becomes the conceptual basis for testing, or if the search for more effective instructional methods is a key reason for testing, then the psychometric tradition is brought into conflict with the practical need to link testing to instructional goals (Sewell, 1987, 1988). The goal of achieving psychometric excellence does not deal with the social consequences of testing, nor does it "provide the kinds of information about process that seems to be necessary for an effective training program that seeks, in fact, to train students in the process (or products) of learning" (Wagner & Sternberg, 1984, p. 193).

Although measurement technology has improved substantially over the past 50 years, psychologists have largely failed to focus on the distinction between tests designed for understanding the processes involved in learning and those used to rank or classify individuals on the basis of educational products. Given this ambiguous situation, one of the major challenges with which measurement specialists must grapple is determining the compatibility of the two legitimate but different goals of assessment: the goal of measurement (accountability, etc.) and the goal of instruction (Cole, 1987).

If the accountability demanded by today's educational reform movement should be extended to testing practices, we need to raise a number of measurement issues in reference to achievement outcomes. Most central is the concern over the issue of *instructional validity* as a technical feature concerned with the assessment benefits to children. Why hasn't this issue been raised more frequently in psychometric methodology? Also, should one interpret the information derived from psychometric instruments designed for the specific goal of measurement in which selection and classification are subsumed as implying instructional relevance as well? The distinction between testing for classification, in which questions of validity and test bias have generated a stream of controversy, and assessing in order to enhance instructional outcomes must be recognized.

Perhaps one of the most persuasive advocates of assessment for instructional intervention is Feuerstein (1979) whose central criticism of conventional psychometric tests of cognitive ability is their "almost total failure to provide detailed and reliable information about each individual's particular strength and difficulties" (p. 34). For Feuerstein, the need to provide information through the testing process for prescriptive teaching and specific intervention for each child constitutes the conceptual basis for assessment. Within this conceptual framework, assessment results should reveal the potential of the individual to be changed or modified through focused learning in the assessment procedure.

If the individual's potential for change or "modifiability" is a valued outcome to be obtained in the context of the assessment situation, and if this can be achieved by engaging the individual in active learning in contrast to assessing past learning experience, how will the pre-eminent psychometric concerns of validity and reliability be judged? The answer to this question lies decidedly in the purposes for which assessment is undertaken. Since educational reform is expected to produce significant academic improvement, assessment should be geared to changing student's performance. Clearly, the point will be rapidly reached where this goal runs counter to the usual psychometric goal of yielding excellent stability coefficients or high test-retest correlations. From this perspective, assessment procedures, whether pertaining to achievement or intelligence, should focus on instructional and consequential validity rather than take comfort in excellent psychometric test features as reflected in stability of performance over time.

If the purpose of testing in schools is reconceptualized so "testing and teaching become integral events," as Glaser (1985) suggests, pedagogical concerns should dictate that low scores on assessment instruments must lead to differential instructional strategies. Instructional decisions should be based on intra-individual performance. Low scores should facilitate and inform instructional actions, thus effectively linking assessment information to the educational needs of the particular child. Perhaps the most promising direction to achieving this goal is through a shift from our overreliance on standardized tests to "alternative" assessment approaches. Fortunately, public concerns grounded in the pervasiveness of academic failure have led to new and innovative approaches to assessment in which "Alternative forms of assessment, forms currently within reach, can adequately reflect today's educational goals and, if properly used, serve as positive tools in creating schools truly capable of teaching students to think" (Resnick & Resnick, 1992, p. 38). To bring this chapter to its conclusion, we would like to review alternative assessment in light of its ability to inform educational practice.

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT

We noted that contemporary psychometric measurement is rooted in Binet's conception of a test designed to sort, rank and classify children who could not profit from regular class instruction. As we also mentioned, the full weight of scientific psychology supports the IQ test, as long as the discussion remains within this practical framework. Yet, despite the scientific legitimacy of the test to predict school performance, the widespread controversy over testing was only partially generated by the ineffectual role of tests in educational programming. To the dismay of concerned citizens, there is evidence to suggest that special class placement, differential expectations and the inferior intellectual capacity ascribed to the hereditary interpretation of racial differences in test performance did not seriously challenge the social and ideological thoughts of past eras (Mensh and Mensh, 1991).

Thus, powerful cultural and political forces, placed within scientific boundaries, have led to the indefensible use of standardized tests for social purposes, such as the formulation of restrictive immigration policies and the mass screening of army recruits-functions that were far removed from the tests' intended use. Given this history, why do Americans now perceive that testing has the potential to be a powerful catalyst to fuel the educational reform movement? Perhaps the fundamental issue driving the shift in testing practice is embedded in the concepts of equity and social justice. In this sociopolitical context, we concur with Curtis and Glaser (1981): "In a society struggling to provide equal opportunities for all of its members, classification and prediction are no longer the prevalent social needs" (p. 133). Accordingly, social and educational dissatisfaction with traditional standardized tests seem to be strongly driven by two related factors: 1. the growing realization that, in the quest for instructional guidance, the benefits from traditional standardized testing are not readily apparent; and 2. the increasing awareness that the cultural changes embedded in society's emerging emphasis on racial, economic and cultural diversity demand equity in educational opportunities.

In reference to the above two factors, if one accepts the notion that there is, indeed, a transformed cultural expectation for all of America's children to achieve, the merits of standardized testing, based on its predictive power or as an index of school improvement for accountability purposes, are not in line with the shift in emphasis to the diagnostic, prescriptive and instructional goals of assessment. Reflecting a basic urge to explore alternative assessment methods, Hunt (1975) noted:

> Psychological assessment should guide teaching. It should tell a teacher what kinds of assignments and curricular materials a given child can utilize profitably to foster his psychological development. The form of psychological assessment now most prevalent in education fails utterly to do this. (p. 545)

Focusing more specifically on educational assessment, others contend that the instructional future will be brighter for students when alternative assessment models become the pre-eminent mode of assessment (Garcia & Pearson, 1994; Wiggins, 1989).

While there is no consensual agreement about the exact definition and properties of standardized testing, most writers would agree that almost every example of a such a test is characterized by standardization, objectivity, norm-referencing, and the use of form-scoring procedures. Alternative assessment, then, is usually defined as the converse of the above, although many forms of this assessment vary considerably in the conceptual orientation to assess, analyze and interpret performance. Central to this orientation is the curriculum-embedded activities in which the assessment practices are grounded. Shapiro, Sewell & DuCette, (1995) have noted the promise of alternative assessment to recognize students' instructional needs, to respond to individual student differences in learning styles, and to reflect the enormous shift in orientation to teaching and learning based on new standards and new knowledge bases in curriculum content. Moreover, given the current emphasis on the instructional process of learning from a longitudinal perspective, there is an underlying focus, regardless of the alternative assessment model, on using assessment processes to stimulate interest in critical self-appraisal, to foster motivation in students, and to monitor personal growth (Murphy & Smith, 1990; Walters, Seidel & Gardner, 1994).

The distinctive characteristics of alternative assessment are captured by a few of the more common labels: "authentic," referring to assessment approaches in which real-life situations form the basis for assessment tasks (Wiggins, 1989); "performance assessment," which focuses on a wide range of products derived from direct involvement with specific tasks; and "dynamic assessment," a process-sensitive model of assessment that requires the systematic engagement of students in structured tasks primarily to determine the conditions under which optimal learning can be achieved (Feuerstein, 1979). (See Garcia & Pearson (1994) for a description of alternative assessment models.)

Whether the assessment strategy emphasizes the processes of learning or products associated with such aspects of school achievement as portfolios or performances, the undergirding concept of alternative assessment is a shift in the testing paradigm that casts doubt on the ability of standardized tests to inform a wide range of issues central to educational reform. Inherent in the multiple choice format of testing, based on a relatively limited sample of behaviors, is the difficulty of accepting performance results as a valid index of learning ability, certification of achievement, effectiveness of instruction or sufficient input for critical self-appraisal. Given these noteworthy limitations for all children in all educational contexts, it is no wonder that in situations where new objectives of educational reform are being formulated, standardized testing is often cited as contributing to current educational problems (Shepard, 1989). That is, many writers concede that standardized testing practices, in general, are implicated in our educational woes, and that test-generated data serve as powerful tools to influence an individual's future, to negatively impact the quality of instruction, and to critically affect political decisions.

If we concede all of these effects on the general population of students in American school, how much more clearly exacerbated are these effects in the testing of minorities. Consequently, there is now considerable interest in alternative assessment from the perspective of student diversity (DuCette, Sewell, & Shapiro, 1996; Shapiro, Sewell & DuCette, 1995); educational equity and access (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Glaser & Silver, 1994) and cultural, linguistic and economic diversity (Garcia & Pearson, 1994).

Alternative assessment, conceptualized as a means to enhance individual achievement rather than as a vehicle to provide data for comparative analysis, has the potential to deal effectively with curriculum content, pedagogy and a wide range of diverse student populations. Furthermore, a primary concern of educational reformers, whether pursuing national economic prosperity or social tranquility, is to shape educational policies to enhance students' success irrespective of social class, ethnicity, race, gender and other differences. Thus, alternative assessment can be contextualized in such a way that it has the potential to assess students' ability, learning and knowledge, even when the curriculum is not uniform and consistent for all students. That is, in this age of multiculturalism, where many parts of the school curriculum have been richly enhanced by materials that reflect cultural compatibility with issues of race, social class and other forms of diversity, alternative assessment is far better able to handle this diversity than standardized assessment.

It is in the context of the widely acknowledged insidious effects of testing on people of color that a major opposition to standardized testing in this chapter is embedded. The social and political arguments against conventional testing over several decades document gross insensitivity to the poor, foreign-born, ethnic minorities and the least advantaged in the society. The overriding social consequences have been powerful and devastating for subgroups in our society who differ from the white, middle-class norm. Among other ways, these effects are manifested in:

1. the exclusion from educational opportunities (Glaser, 1985)
2. the generation and sustenance of ideological barriers to expanded social and economic opportunities (Karier, 1973; Sewell, 1981)
3. the reinforcement of differential learning opportunities and social inequities (Darling-Hammond, 1994)
4. the establishment of restrictive immigration policies for selected groups in the United States (Kamin, 1974)

In light of the existing, persuasive arguments that standardized measurement is rooted in conceptions of social justice and human ability insensitive to diversity as a social and educational reality, we must not restructure and rebuild assessment practices while retaining a foundation based on old premises, questionable assumptions, and highly controversial and instructionally-irrelevant theories of human potential. Alternative assessment does not simply emphasize new instruments, new and novel ways to interpret old tests, or new and creative approaches to using standardized tests in the framework of a broader assessment/diagnostic context. More fundamentally, the conceptual framework on which it rests dictates a new way of thinking about the causes of behavior, a new focus on generating information to inform teaching, and a new emphasis on egalitarian principles of equality of opportunity in a pluralistic society. Darling-Hammond (1994) and others have put in sharp focus the notion of "consequential validity" to describe:

> the extent to which an assessment tool *and the ways in which it is used* produce positive consequences both for the teaching and learning process and for students who may experience difficult educational opportunities as a result of test based placement. (p. 11)

While the current educational reform movement must attempt to increase the achievement of all students, its real impact will be judged ultimately by the extent to which it succeeds in educating minorities, disadvantaged students and all of the other subgroups who have been badly served by our educational system in the past. Differences in achievement attributable to factors related to learning styles, sociocultural experiences, race, ethnic distinctiveness and levels of ability necessarily require an assessment system diverse in conceptualization, ideology, methodology and purpose. We believe that alternative assessment can indeed be a catalyst for curriculum revision, enlightened instructional strategies and a systematic attention to students' self-assessment and growth over time within the framework of the 3 P's—performance, portfolios, and products (Madaus, 1993, p. 10).

But the promise of alternative assessment's contribution to student achievement is matched by the daunting challenge of resolving many critical issues related to conceptual clarity, mechanisms for self-criticism and standardization of assessment judgments (Worthen, 1993). And because we know that proponents of standardized tests have made the claim, though not convincingly, that tests such as the IQ offer objective assessment and less opportunity for teacher bias in a visibly discriminatory society, we must not assume that alternative assessment will automatically be used intelligently and wisely.

We know that no alternative assessment model will erase society's historical record of deep-seated insensitivity to issues of equity and access, particularly for people of color. Nevertheless, the irrelevant ideological barriers to equality of educational opportunities, effective instructional strategies, student/teacher self-appraisal and high academic standards are not currently interwoven with the conceptual framework of alternative assessment. Thus, possibility and promise still exist for social justice and equality to be embedded in the link between educational reform and assessment. This moment in the educational reform movement is a window of opportunity, which must not be missed and which leads us to believe that the future has never been brighter. Perhaps, in fact, we may eventually bury the legacy of past injustices and echo the compassionate words of Gould (1981):

> We pass through this world but once. Few tragedies can be more extensive than the stunting of life, few injustices deeper than the denial of an oppor-

> tunity to strive or even hope, by a limit imposed from without, but falsely identified as lying within. (p. 28)

REFERENCES

Berliner, D. (1993). Mythology and the American system of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *74*(8), 632–640.

Bersoff, D. (1981). Testing and the law. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 1047–1056.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradiction of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Bracey, G. (1993) The condition of public education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(2), 104–117.

Carroll, J., & Horn, J. (1981). On the scientific basis of ability testing. *American Psychologist*, *36*, 1012–1020.

Clark, D., & Astuto, T. (1994). Redirecting reform: Challenges to popular assumptions about teachers and students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(7), 512–520.

Cleary, T., Humphreys, L., Kendrick, S., & Wesman, A. (1975). Educational uses of tests with disadvantaged students. *American Psychologist*, 30, 15–41.

Cole, N. (1987). *A realist's appraisal of the prospects for unifying instruction and assessment*. Paper presented at the ETS Invitational Conference on Assessment in the Service of Learning, Princeton, NJ.

Curtis, M. & Glaser, R. (1981). Changing conceptions of intelligence. In D. Berliner (Ed.), *Review of Educational Research* (pp.) Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transpiration. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *74*(10) 752–761.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Performance-based assessment and educational equity. *Harvard Education Review*, *64*, (1), 5–29.

Diana v. State Board of Education. C-70 37 RFP District Court for Northern California, 1970.

DuCette, J. P., Sewell, T. E. & Shapiro, J. P. (in press). Diversity in education: Possibilities and problems. In *A knowledge based for teacher education*, edited by Frank Murray for the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Eckberg, D. (1979) *Intelligence and Race: The Original and Dimensions of the IQ controversy*. New York: Praeger.

Elliott, R. (1987). Litigating intelligence: *IQ tests, special education and social science in the courtroom*. Dover, DC: Auburn House Publishing Co.

Feuerstein, R. (1979). *The dynamic assessment of retarded performers: The learning potential assessment device, theory, instruments, and techniques*. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Feuerstein, R. (1979) The dynamic assessment of retarded performers. The learning potential assessment device, theory, instruments, and techniques. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Garcia, G. E. & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Assessment and Diversity in *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 20, Edited by Linda Darling-Hammond. Published by the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Gardner, H. (1983) *Frames of mind.* New York: Basic Books Inc.

Gifford, B. (1989) The allocation of opportunities and the politics of testing: A policy analytic perspective. In Bernard Gifford (Ed.) *Test Policy and the Politics of Opportunity Allocation: The Workplace and the Law* (p.3–32) Boston: Kluwer Academic Pub.

Glaser, R. (1985) *The integration of instruction and testing.* Paper presented at the ETS Invitational Conference on the Redesign of Testing for the 21st Century, Princeton, NJ.

Glaser, R., & Silver, E. (1994). Assessment, testing and instruction: Retrospect and prospect. In L. Darling-Hammond, *Review of Educational Research in Education* (Vol. 20, pp. 393–419) Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Gould, J. S. (1981). *The mismeasure of man.* New York: Norton & Co.

Guadalupe v. Tempe Elementary School District. District Court for Arizona, 71–435, 1972.

Haney, W. (1993). Testing and Minorities. In M. Fine & L. Weis (Eds.), *Beyond Silenced Voices* (pp. 45–73). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Haney, W. (1981). Validity, vaudeville, and values. *American Psychologist, 36,* 1021–1034.

Heller, K. Holtzman, W. & Mesnick, S. (1982). Placing children is Special Education: A Strategy for Equity. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Hunt, J. M. (1975). Psychological assessment in education and social class. In B. Friedlander, G. Sterritt, & G. Kirk (Eds.), *Exceptional infant* (Vol. 3). New York: Bruner-Mazel.

Jackson, G. (1975). On the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Educational Uses of Tests with Disadvantaged Students. *American Psychologist, 30,* 88–92.

Jensen, A. (1980). *Bias in mental testing.* New York: Free Press.

Kamin, L. (1974). *The science and politics of IQ.* Potomac, MD: Lawrnece Erlbaum Associates.

Karier, C. (1973). Testing for order and control in the corporate liberal state. In C. Karier, P. Violas, & J. Spring (Eds.), *Roots of crisis: American educations in the twentieth century.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Larry P. v. Wilson Riles, N. CO-71-2270 RFP, U.S. District Court for Northern California, 1979.

Lawler, J. M. (1978). *IQ, heritability and racism.* New York: International Publishers.

Madaus, G. (1993). A national testing system: Manna from above? A historical technological perspective. *Educational Assessment,* 1(19), 9–26.

Mensh, E., & Mensh, H. (1991). *The IQ mythology.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Mercer, J. (1989). Alternative paradigms for assessment in a pluralistic society. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (pp. 289-304). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Moffett, J. (1994). On the past: Wrong-headed school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 75*(8), 584–590.

Montagu, A. (Ed.). (1975). *Race and IQ.* London: Oxford University Press.

Murphy, S., & Smith, M. A. (1990). Talking about portfolios. *The Quarterly of the National Writing Project and the Center for the Study of Writing,* 12(1), 1–3.

National Commission of Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at risk:* The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Gov't. Printing Office.

PASE v. Hannon, 506 F. Supp. 831 (N. D. Ill. 1980).

Rebell, M. (1989). Testing, public policy and the courts. In B. Gifford (Ed.), *Testing policy and the politics of opportunity allocations: The workplace and the law* (pp. 135-162). Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Resnick, L. B. & Resnick, D. P. (1992). Assessing the thinking curriculum: New tool for educational reform. In B. Gifford & M. O'Connor (Eds.), *Changing assessments: alternative views of aptitude, achievement and instruction.* Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Samuda, R. (1975). *Psychological testing of American minorities: Issues and consequences.* New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Schiff, M., & Lewontin, R. (1986). *Education and class: The irrelevance of IQ genetic studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sewell, T. (1981). Shaping the future of school psychology: Another perspective. *School Psychology Review,* 2, 232–242.

Sewell, T. E. (1987). Dynamic assessment as a nondiscriminatory procedure. In C. Lidz (Ed.), *Dynamic assessment* (pp. 426–443). New York: Guilford Publications.

Sewell, T. (1988). Intellectual assessment of at-risk students: Classification vs. instructional goals. In B. Presseisen (Ed.), *At-risk students and thinking: Perspectives from research* (pp. 104–116). Philadelphia: National Educational Association/Research for Better Schools.

Sewell, T., Price, V., & Karp, R. (1993). The ecology of poverty, undernutrition, and learning failure. In R. Karp (Ed.), *Malnourished Children in the United States: Caught in the cycle of poverty* (pp. 24–30). New York: Springer Publishing.

Sewell, T. E. (1979). Intelligence and learning tasks as predictors of scholastics achievement in black and white first grade children. *Journal of School Psychology, 17,* 325–332.

Shapiro, J., Sewell, T., & DuCette, J. (1995). *Reframing diversity in education.* Lancaster: Technomic Press.

Shepard, L. (1989). Why we need better tests. *Educational Leadership, 46*(4), 22–27.

Sternberg, R. (1988). Ability tests, measurement, and markets. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(2), 134–140.

Stevenson, H. (1992). Learning from Asian schools. *Scientific American,* 70–76.

Terman, L. (1916). *The measurement of intelligence.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Wagner, R., & Sternberg, R. (1984). Alternative conceptions and intelligence and their implications for education. *Review of Educational Research, 54,* 179–223.

Walters, J., Seidel, S., & Gardner, H. (1994). Children as reflective practitioners: Bringing metacognition to the classroom. In C. Collins and J. Mangieri (Eds.), *Mindfulness: Creating powerful thinkers* (pp.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich.

Wiggins, G. (1989). A true test: Towards a more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70,* 703–713.

Winner, L. (1986). *The whale and the reactor: A search for limits in an age of high technology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Worthen, B. (1993). Critical issues that will determine the future of alternative assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(6): (444–454).

Author Index

A
Antelo, A. 106, 108, *112*
Astin, H. 39, *48*
Astuto, T. 111, *112*, *147*, *163*
Attanucci, J. 12, *30*

B
Babco, E. L. 34, *50*
Ballard, A. 115, *116*, *130*
Banziger, G. 124, *130*
Banks, J. A. 124, *130*, *142*, *144*
Barnett, R. 43, 47, *48*
Baruch, G. 43, 47, *48*
Basow, S. A. 39, *48*
Bateson, M. C. 6, 12, *29*
Belenky, M. F. 6, 12, *29*
Bell, D. A. 117, *130*
Bennett, S. K. 39, *48*
Bennis, W. *29*
Berger, T. K., Jr. 89, 92, *102*
Berliner, D. 147, *163*
Bersoff, D. 154, *163*
Billingsley, A. 124, *130*
Bird, G. 34, 37, 40, *48*
Blake, R. 89, 94, 95, *102*
Blanchard, K. 28, *30*
Blase, J. 108, *112*
Boice, R. 39, *48*
Boles, K. 110, 111, *113*
Bond, L. 125, *130*
Bowles, S. 152, *163*
Boxill, B. 117, *130*
Boyer, E. L. 126, *130*
Boyle, R. A. 142, *144*
Bracey, G. 147, *163*
Braddock, J. H. 8, 9, 24, *29*
Bragg, S. M., 6, *30*
Brookover, W. 122, *125*, *130*
Brooks, A. A. 42, *48*
Brown, B. L. 108, *113*
Bruno, A. 38, *50*
Burke, B. W. 39, *50*

C
Calhoun, C. 116, *132*
Carmichael, S. 117, *130*
Carroll, J. 153, *163*
Chamberlain, M. K. 34, 35, *48*
Christiansen, M. D. 11, *29*
Clark, D. 111, *112*, *147*, *163*
Clark, K. 116, *130*
Clarke, J. H. 120, *130*
Clarke-Stewart, A. 41, *48*
Cleary, T. 153, 156, *163*
Clinchy, B. M. 6, 12, *29*
Cole, J. 6, 22, *29*, 39, *48*
Cole, N. 157, *163*
Conley, D. T. 106, *107*, *113*
Cope, W. 124, *131*
Crosby, F. J. 43, 47, *48*
Crummell, A. 119, *130*
Cruse, H. 118, *131*
Curtis, M. 159n, *163*

D
Damerell, R. *102*
Darling-Hammond, L. *125*, *131*, 148, 160, 161, 162n, *163*
Davis, D. 39, *48*
Davis, L. 35, 37, *50*
Davis, O. 120, *131*
Davison, K. 36, 39, *49*

Dearmin, E. 26, *29*
Deci, E. L. 110, *112*
DeFleur, L. B. 34, 35, 37, *50*
Delpit, L. 70, 75, *83*
Dilworth, M. E. 67, 72, 77, *82*, *83*
Douglass, F. 115, 118, *131*
Driscoll, D. M. 35, 40, 41, 45, 47, *48*
DuBois, W. E. B. 116, 118, 120, *131*
DuCette, J. P. 150, 151, 159, 160, *163*
Dunlap, D. M. 106, 107, *113*

E
Eberspacher, J. 11, 16, *29*
Eckberg, D. 153, *163*
Edmonds, R. R. 123, *127*, *131*
Elliott, R. 153, *163*
Eisenstein, Z. R. 40, *48*
Eisner, E. W. 108, *113*
Emmer, E. T. 127, *132*
Estes, C. P. 58, *59*

F
Fairweather, J. S. 33, *50*
Fernandez, J. P. 10, 26, *29*
Fernstermacher, G. D. *64*, *66*
Ferris, J. M. 105, *113*
Feuerstein, R. 157n, 160, *164*
Finkel, S. K. 36, *49*
Fiske, S. T. 8, 10, *30*
Franklin, V. P. 118, 124, *131*

G
Garcia, G. E. 156n, 159, 160, *164*
Gardner, H. 156, 160, *164*, *166*
Garibaldi, A. M. *69*, *83*
Gay, G. 141, *144*
Gifford, B. 149, *164*
Gilligan, C. 6, 12, 28, *30*
Gilliland, J. R. 6, *30*
Gintis, H. 152, *163*
Glaser, R. 155, 158, 159n, 160, 161, *163*, *164*
Glazer, A. 33, 36, 39, *49*
Glickman, C. D. 112, *113*
Goldberg, C. R. 35, 40, 41, 45, 47, *48*
Goldberger, N. R. 6, 12, *29*
Goldman, P. 106, 107, *113*
Goodlad, J. 87, *102*, 127, *131*
Gordon, V. V. 124, *131*
Gould, J. S. 151, 152n, *163n*, *164*

H
Hacker, A. 6, 7, 25, *30*
Hajnal, V. J. 36, *49*
Halcon, J. J. 117, 123, *132*
Hamburg, D. 128, *131*
Hamilton, C. V. 117, *130*
Hamovitch, W. 39, *49*
Haney, W. 153, 155, *164*
Harding, V. 119, *131*
Harris, N. 115, *131*
Harris, R. L. Jr. 121, *131*
Hawkins, D. 67, 74, *83*
Heath, J. A. 36, *49*
Heller, G. S. 104, 110, *113*
Heller, K. 155, *164*
Hensel, N. 36, 37, 38, 39, *49*
Hersey, P. 28, *30*
Hiatt, D. 101, *102*
Higginbotham, A. L. 115, 116, 117, *118*, *131*
Hilliard, A. G. 116, *132*
Hochschild, A. 33, 37, 40, *49*
Hodgkinson, H. L. 3, *30*
Hoffman, L. 42, *49*
Holt, M. E. 36, 37, *49*
Holtzman, W. 155, *164*
Horn, J. 153, *163*
Howard, J. R. 120, *131*
Howe, H. 125, *131*
Hoy, W. K. *108*, *113*
Hoyle, J. R. 105, 107, *113*
Humphreys, L. 153, *156*, *163*
Hunt, J. M. 158n, *164*

I
Irvine, J. J. 141, *144*

J
Jackson, G. 155, *164*
Jensen, A. 156, *164*
Johnson, M. 11, *29*

K
Kalantzis, M. 124, *131*
Kamin, L. 150, 152, 153, 161, *164*
Kanter, R. B. 33, 40, *49*
Kanter, R. M. 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 19, 22, 26, 28, *30*
Kaplan, S. 6, 11, *30*
Karier, C. 161, *164*
Karp, R. 151, *165*

Kearse, G. S. 117, *131*
Keating, P. 122, 125, 126, 127, *128*, *131*
Keller, S. 116, *132*
Kelly, K. 39, *48*
Kendrick, S. 153, *156*, *163*
Kennedy, M. M. 142, 143, *144*
Kimmel, M. 41, 47, *49*
Kirkland, F. 119, 123, *131*
Koestenbaum, P. *102*
Kofodimos, J. 46, *49*
Koshland, D. E. 34, *49*
Kouzes, J. 100, *102*
Kruger, P. 42, *49*

L
Lange, J. T. 106, *113*
Laughlin, P. 37, *49*
Lawler, J. M. 152, *165*
Levin, H. M. 128, *132*
Lewis, J. L. 36, 40, *49*
Lewontin, R. 151, *152*, *165*
Light, D. 116, *132*
Lindsay, B. 12, 26, *30*
Little, J. W. 109, *113*
Lorde, A. 6, 12, *30*
Lorenz, G. E. 36, *50*

M
Macagno-Shang, L. 11, *29*
Madans, G. 151, *162*, *165*
Mancino, A. 36, 39, *49*
Marable, M. 117, 119, 122, *132*
Marher, J. D. 6, *30*
Martin, J. 6, 8, 9, 10, 24, 27, *30*
Martin, M. 39, *49*
Marx, R. W. 142, *144*
McBay, S. M. 71, *83*
McLaughlin, M. W. 109, *113*
McPartland, J. M. 8, 9, 24, *29*
Mensh, E. 158, *165*
Mentell, E. J. 104, 110, *113*
Mercer, J. 153, *165*
Midgley, C. 103, 104, *106*, *113*
Mock, C. 38, *50*
Moffett, J. 148, *165*
Montagu, A. 153, *165*
Moody-Adams, M. M. *123*, *132*
Moore, K. 6, 11, *30*, 34, 35, 36, 38, *50*
Morganstern, R. D. 39, *49*
Mouton, J. 89, 94, 95, *102*
Murphy, S. 160, *165*
Myrdal, G. 7, *30*

N
Nanus, B. 11, *29*
Nettleford, R. 125, *132*
Newmann, F. M. 105, 108, *109*, *113*
North, J. D. 10, 12, 26, *30*
Nye, F. I. 42, *49*

O
Oakes, J. 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, *131*
Odden, A. *107*, *113*
Ovando, M. N. 106, 108, *112*

P
Paine, T. 3, *30*
Parrott, J. 12, *30*
Pearson, P. D. 150n, 159, 160, *164*
Pelletier, L. G. 110, *112*
Pettigrew, T. F. 6, 8, 9, 10, 24, 27, *30*
Petrach, S. I. 136, *144*
Piche, D. M. 128, *132*
Pine, G. 116, *132*
Pink, W. 123, *132*
Pintrich, P. R. *142*, *144*
Polatnick, M. R. 35, *50*
Posner, B. 100, *102*
Price, V. 151, *165*

R
Ray, L. R. 120, *132*
Rebell, M. 153n, *154*, *165*
Reskin, B. F. 39, *50*
Resnick, D. P. *158*, *165*
Resnick, L. B. 158, *165*
Reyes, M. de la luz 117, *123*, *132*
Rivers, C. 43, 47, *48*
Rogers, J. L. 12, 28, *30*
Rosenholtz, S. J. 110, *113*
Rowan, B. 109, *113*
Rubin, I. 111, *102*
Russell, S. H. 33, *49*
Ryan, R. M. 110, *112*

S
Sacken, D. 105, 110, 111, *113*
Salimbene, A. M. 6, *30*
Samuda, R. 151, *165*
Sanford, J. P. 127, *132*
Sarason, S. 87, 96, *102*
Schiff, M. 151, 152, *165*
Schwartz, H. 87, *102*
Scott, H. J. 129, *132*

Seidel, S. 99, *102*, 160, *166*
Sewell, T. 150, 151, 156, 159, 160, 161, *163*, *165*
Shade, B. J. 139, *144*
Shepard, L. 160, *166*
Shapiro, J. P. 150, 151, *159*, *163*
Shavlik, D. 35, 37, *50*
Shellenbarger, S. 42, *50*
Silberg, N. T. 39, *48*
Silver, E. 155, 156, 160, *164*
Sisler, G. 11, 16, *29*
Sizemore, B. A. 125, *132*
Smith, J. C., Jr. 77, *83*
Smith, M. A. 160, *165*
Smylie, M. A. 103, 106, 107, 108, *113*
Sleeter, C. E. 137, 139, *144*, *145*
Spencer, M. B. 75, *84*
Staley, K. H. 11, *29*
Stamler, V. L. 11, *29*
Stecklein, J. E. 36, *50*
Stephan, W. G. 10, *30*
Sternberg, R. 156, *166*
Stevens, A. 44, *50*
Stevenson, H. *166*
Swinton, D. 118, *122*, *132*

T
Tarule, J. M. 6, 12, *29*
Taylor, S. E. 10, *30*
Taylor, W. L. 128, *132*
Terman, L. 152, *166*
Tinsley, A. 6, 11, *30*
Touchton, J. 35, 37, *50*
Trout-Baretta, M. J. 37, *49*
Troen, V. 110, 111, *113*
Tuckman, H. 36, *49*

V
Vallace, E. 141, *145*
Vallerand, R. J. 110, *112*
Vetter, B. M. 34, *50*

W
Wagner, R. 156, *166*
Walters, J. 160, *166*
Warner, R. 34, 35, 37, *50*
Welch, L. *31*
Wesman, A. 153, *156*, *163*
White, P. A. 106, 108, 110, *113*
Widom, C. S. 39, *50*
Wiggins, G. 154, 159, 160, *166*
Wiley III, E. 3, *31*
Willis, S. 141, *145*
Wilson, R. 37, 38, *50*
Winner, L. 151n, *166*
Wise, A. 143, *145*
Wohlstetter, P. *107*, *113*
Wood, S. 103, 104, 106, *113*
Woodson, C. G. 119, 120, *132*
Worthen, B. 162, *166*

Y
Young, C. A. 124, *132*
Yuker, H. E. 33, *50*

Z
Zimbler, L. J. 33, *50*
Zuckerman, H. 39, *48*

It is a core premise of this book that the thoughts and voices of those excluded are distinct. It is also our belief that, once heard, there is insight and new visions embedded in these voices. Just as we came to know more about racism from DuBois, more about the Holocaust from Anne Frank, so can we come to know more about the critical issues facing education from the chapters of this book.

—"Introduction"
Louis A. Castenell
& Jill M. Tarule

9 781567 503197
1-56750-319-5